

UNITED WE STAND, DIVIDED WE FALL

PEACE THROUGH A DISENTANGLING ALLIANCE

By ROBERT STEIN

Union of the four great democracies of Britain, France, Germany, and the United States into an irresistible, beneficent power, to bestow peace on the world and to bring liberty, enlightenment, and progress to backward and oppressed nations.

Prepare the way for mediation by offering our alliance to the other three great democracies.

To make America supreme among the nations, through supreme service rendered, is the truest Americanism.

OPINIONS.

"A definite peace plan at last."—James Geddes, Jr.

"We have climbed upward in the group organization from the patriarchal family through clan and tribe to the nation, and logically the next step must be the **SUPER-NATION**. In all human probability your proposition is in the direct line of evolution, and is one of the steps that men have got to take if they are going to adjust themselves to the highly complex environment with which they are now confronted."

"I think it my duty to express the deep conviction that any German-American who opposes your plan will prove not a friend, but an enemy to Germany."—A German-American.

'I am sure that I speak the mind and wish of the people of America when I say that the United States is willing to become a partner in any feasible association of nations.'—President Wilson, May 27, 1916.



WASHINGTON, D. C.
JUDD & DETWEILER, Inc., PRINTERS
1916

PROPOSED JOINT RESOLUTION

To Prepare the Way for Mediation in the Present European War and to Establish Permanent Peace.

Whereas permanent peace is not possible without an irresistible power to enforce it, which power must necessarily consist of a preponderant and well-united league of nations; and

Whereas international agreements aiming to maintain the world's peace cannot safely be trusted to bear the test of trial in time of stress, unless they are primarily designed to promote the self-interests of the contracting parties; and

Whereas the true self-interests of Britain, France, Germany, and the United States, the most democratic, most enlightened, most progressive great nations, comprising by far the larger part of civilization, are most nearly identical and therefore most apt to be promoted by union, being at the same time most nearly identical with the best interests of all humanity; and

Whereas a league of these four nations, though primarily designed for their own benefit, would by its overwhelming strength be enabled, and by sheer self-interest be compelled, to enforce the world's peace; and

Whereas such a league of civilization, cemented by common interests, would constitute a solid, reliable, preponderant nucleus, whose magnetism would quickly attract the Scandinavian States, the Netherlands, and other free States, and thus afford the easiest and surest path to a world federation which would not be in danger of deadlock and disruption; and

Whereas the union of the four great democracies into an irresistible power would be the surest and quickest means to democratize the world—to bring liberty, enlightenment, and progress to oppressed and backward nations; and

Whereas the prospect of an alliance for mutual benefit between Britain, France, Germany, and the United States would suggest to the belligerents a possibility of withdrawing from the conflict with mutual advantage, and would thus constitute the best preparation for early and effective mediation; and

Whereas the leadership toward perpetual peace would secure to the United States the place of honor among the nations for all time to come; and

Whereas the Government cannot easily take steps in the matter until it knows whether the people are willing to abandon the tradition of "no alliances"; and

Whereas it would be unjust, unpatriotic, and undemocratic to deny to our citizens the right to express their wishes on a question of such supreme importance to them: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is desirable to have a popular vote on the following question:

Shall the United States, after the European war, offer to conclude a defensive alliance with Britain, France, and Germany?

PETITION IN FAVOR OF THE PRECEDING RESOLUTION

WASHINGTON, D. C., September 11, 1916.

HON. WILLIAM SCHLEY HOWARD,
House of Representatives.

SIR: The undersigned members of the American Federation of Labor are informed that you have been requested to introduce the following resolution:

Resolved, etc., That it is desirable to have a popular vote on the following question:

Shall the United States, after the present European war, offer to conclude a defensive alliance with Britain, France, and Germany?

The only permanent safeguard of peace will be a union of nations, or, as President Wilson expressed it, "a feasible association of nations." In whatever form it comes, it must first be submitted to the people. The above resolution would do this. If there is any means that offers even the slightest promise of shortening the horrible conflict now going on, it should not be neglected. It seems to us that this resolution could not possibly do any harm, and might be productive of great good. We understand that the purpose is not to secure Congressional action in the near future, but to start a campaign of education.

The sufferings of war fall mostly on the working people; hence it is fit that the labor organizations should take the lead in the movement for permanent peace. It is to their interest that the guardianship of peace be entrusted to the four great democracies of Britain, France, Germany, and the United States, in which the labor element possesses the greatest power. Moreover, the union of these four nations will practically mean the union of the entire white race, and will thus put an end to the danger of Asiatic immigration.

Addis, Mrs. W. W.	Hafle, C. W.	Reapsomer, Mrs. M. C.
Barrett, Miss C.	Harper, James E.	Rhine, J. H.
Barrett, Miss E.	Henry, Mrs. M.	Ridgely, Miss Rosa B.
Barringer, Arthur B.	Klotz, Mrs. A.	Roney, Miss A.
Blue, Miss Anna	Knight, A. C.	Ruff, Wm. R.
Braddock, A. A.	Lee, Miss L. M.	Rush, Miss Ronah
Brown, Walter P.	Lowd, P. I.	Scott, Gurnon R.
Cook, W. H.	McCauley, J. M.	Simpson, Thos. C.
Crouch, Mrs. H. E.	McCeney, V.	Smith, J. M.
Davis, Joseph F.	McKay, E. R.	Stahl, J. B.
Dickerson, A. H.	McLaughlin, James	Stormont, Miss M.
Duncan, Mrs. A.	Maddox, A. P.	Stormont, W. T.
Eckloff, Mrs. L.	Marshall, Geo. S.	Tyrrell, David E.
Elliott, T. P.	Morrison, G. J.	Ward, Miss A.
Fabrizio, Michael	Morrow, Mrs. M.	Williams, Wm.
Fellinger, F. G.	Murphy, P. S.	Wilson, Wm. L.
Fisk, Mrs. E. P.	Nalley, John H.	Woodward, Denham
Fleming, H. S.	Nock, N. N.	Yeager, E. O.
Gilliland, W. H.	Owens, Miss M.	
Haarer, Victor E.	Pecho, Mrs. Lucy	

A similar petition, addressed to another Member of Congress, was signed on August 24 and 27 by the following members of the Ninth Street Christian Church of Washington, D. C.:

Ashford, M. S.	Kent, James G.	Pirtle, T. R.
Carpenter, F. A.	Kidwell, Geo. W.	Putnam, O. T.
Carroll, Mrs. T. A.	Kitchin, C. A.	Richards, Wm. H.
Darnall, H. Carl	Kulp, E. C.	Saunders, G. B.
De Groot, H. B.	Llewellyn, T. J.	Sherier, A. W.
Dooley, Geo. A.	Lomax, E. L.	Shook, D. S.
Floyd, J. B.	McCurdy, Wm. C.	Sparks, E. M.
Freeman, C. P.	McCurdy, W. S.	Stephenson, E. T.
Gaver, J. W.	Morrison, F.	Stephenson, Mrs. E. T.
Gravatt, R. H.	Myers, Geo. L.	Stephenson, J. T.
Heatwole, Mrs. O. W.	Nikirk, H. H.	Trice, W. H.
Hostetler, T. A.	Phillips, C. D.	Warfield, Ernest

PEACE THROUGH A DISENTANGLING ALLIANCE.

BY ROBERT STEIN.

Shall we remain idle spectators of the greatest horror in history, when we have the power to stop it?

The world looks to the United States for mediation. The President offered mediation once, and promised to offer it again at the opportune moment. Has not that moment arrived? By this time, surely, the combatants must be in a mood to listen to a proposal to extricate them from the deadlocked agony which threatens to continue indefinitely. Mediation would come in the nick of time.

Merely to inquire whether mediation would be acceptable were almost an idle formality. Neither party can easily stop fighting if by so doing it would leave its future in uncertainty. If we are sincere in our professed desire to establish permanent peace, we must present to the combatants a plan which will make it safe for them to stop fighting.

The Turning-point of History.

The offer of a defensive alliance of the United States with Britain, France, and Germany would accomplish two things: (1) Stop the war, (2) Make peace permanent.

(1) STOP THE WAR.

The proposed offer, virtually amounting to an offer of Anglo-American reunion, would promptly lead to an understanding between Britain and Germany.

Perpetual Security of the British Empire.

In the words of her statesmen, Britain is "fighting for life," in the belief that the defeat of her allies would leave her at the mercy of Germany. Nothing but the conviction of this seemingly inexcusable necessity could have moved Britain to undertake the gruesome and increasingly hopeless task of crushing her own Mother, the land of universities, the land without illiterates. If Britain and her Gigantic Daughter were reunited, if the restored English-speaking nation possessed the assurance that all its members were ready to defend their common patrimony, as Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa are today defending the British empire, Britain would no longer feel that she was fighting for life, knowing that the power of united Anglo-Saxondom would always be invincible.

Germany Must Be Included.

Thus as soon as the virtual offer of Anglo-American reunion is made, as soon as Britain is thus invited by us to accept the guarantee of perpetual security, she will no longer have any motive to continue the fight, but every motive to make peace on terms acceptable to Germany, in order to fulfill the condition accompanying the guarantee. Anglo-American reunion is evidently impossible without the consent of the German-Americans, which will not be given unless Germany be included. When this is accomplished, Britain will no longer have any motive to oppose her Mother's expansion, but, on the contrary, every motive to aid her in acquiring any lands not owned by Britain herself.

Germany is Willing.

The recently published interview of Mr. S. S. McClure with Dr. Paul Rohrbach and other prominent Germans indicates

that this solution will be welcomed in Germany. It will be remembered that the late Admiral Breusing, of the German navy, expressed the same views a few months before the war. At that time, with Lord Haldane's visit to Berlin fresh in men's minds, it seemed not merely probable, but certain, that the differences between Britain and Germany were approaching an early settlement, which might before long have ripened into an alliance. Germany had expressed her willingness to agree to a limitation of naval armaments, while Mr. Asquith had declared that Britain, owning nearly one-fourth of the earth's surface, had enough land and did not intend to acquire more, but was willing to leave the control of the remaining backward lands to Germany.

"From many of the leading men in Berlin," says Mr. McClure, "I have sought an explanation of the diplomatic negotiations of the fateful week that preceded the war. I am always answered that the war was equally unexpected and unwanted in Germany and England. That the mobilization of Russia was the determining factor is the conviction of those best informed and most responsible for Germany's acts.

"What is the ideal solution of the world situation, and how can world peace be best secured?"

"The answer to these two questions is surprisingly unanimous: An alliance between the United States, England, and Germany, not as against the world, nor in any way minimizing the status and rights of the allies of these nations.

"Such an alliance would settle the questions of the freedom of the seas, would insure absolute security for trade and against war on the Atlantic and Pacific, and, as affirmed by many of the ablest and most influential men I have met, would secure the peace of the world for centuries.

"Is such a plan feasible? England and Germany had very nearly concluded negotiations that would have removed all causes of friction and insured peace."

German Cheers for Germanic Union.

The same ideas are put forward in an editorial in the New York *Evening Mail* of June 3, 1916, under the title of "Anglo-Saxons."

"One striking incident stands forth in the story which S. S. McClure Thursday night told of his experiences on the continent. It was not the marvelous tales of German efficiency in economic organization, nor the strange picture of fighting fronts where no living thing was visible. The striking sketch which Mr. McClure drew was of a dinner with the general and staff of the Twelfth army on the Russian front. The American arose and proposed a toast to an alliance of England, Germany, and the United States in the work of carrying forward civilization and peace. *The German staff answered the toast with cheers.*

In 1902, when Cecil Rhodes' will was read, it was found to contain provision for liberal scholarships for Americans and Germans at Oxford. These are the words in which he explained his gift:

'The object is that an understanding between the three great powers will render war impossible, and educational relations make the strongest tie.'

It does the heart good to learn that amid all the horrors and hates of war the ideal of an Anglo-Saxon [this term is evidently used in the sense of "Germanic"] leadership of the world still lives. Its roots are deeper than the alliances and intrigues that fester around the outbreak of this war. That sentiment of a common destiny of co-operation, not of civil strife, between these three nations, is in the blood.

Those who work to foment hate between England and Germany work against the Anglo-Saxon idea. The world needs both of them in full undiminished strength and sovereignty. British traditionalism and German rationalism are the two qualities which, if combined with the force and energy of the new American world power, will furnish the

elements and set the pace for world progress. Enough of this talk of England destroying Germany or Germany destroying England. Either event would mean the same calamity as for one of them to destroy the United States.

In their hearts what do Germany and England want? Security. What does the United States most want today? Security. Can any man name a way so certain to reach this goal as by the realization of an Anglo-Saxon understanding? Or is there any other way so certain, so easy of attainment, for assuring the peace and progress of the world? It is an alliance for which our instincts cry out, an alliance which can be widened to embrace more extensive forms of internationalism.

The alternative? Germany seeks security. She finds it with us or elsewhere. If we shut her out from England and America in the west, she will turn to alien strangers in the east. No one who knows politics doubts that Germany can in the future achieve an alliance with Russia and Japan, if she will pay the price. Nor would the price come out of Germany's pocket. It would be paid from the coffers of civilization; the price would be the occidental abandonment of Asia.

No responsible thinking person wants to face such an eventuality. Germany belongs where she seeks to be: with her brothers in the west."

Incredible as it may seem, some German-American papers sneered at this editorial as pro-British, not noticing the fact that it is essentially pro-German. They seem to have been misled by the unfortunate use of the term "Anglo-Saxon."

France Must Be Included.

An alliance between Britain and Germany is impossible unless France be included. When Britain, France, and the United States on the one hand, and Britain, Germany, and the United States on the other, are ready for the alliance, the pressure for mutual concessions between France and

Germany will become irresistible. The ink-begotten, ink-fed "hereditary enmity," unscrubbed, unprattled, unknown 150 years ago, will yield to compromise, just as the much older "hereditary enmity" between Britain and France did in 1904.

Bernard Shaw Pleads for a Quadruple Alliance.

A dispatch to the New York *Times* dated London, November 24, 1915, says: "A league of western civilization as a preventive against future war was the suggestion thrown out by George Bernard Shaw in an address delivered last night. He pictured a combination of white civilization from the Rockies to the Carpathians, organized on a democratic basis. In this league he wished to see America, France, England, and Germany, who would be joined for their own protection by Belgium and the Scandinavian states. England was showing Germany, he said, that she had better be England's friend than her enemy.

'I do not believe,' he said, 'that there can be any peace in the world until there is peace between England, France, and Germany.' "

Germany is also trying to show England that she had better be Germany's friend than her enemy. Which of the two countries needs the lesson more? And can't either of them think of a less costly method of teaching?

England Favors a Peace Union.

A dispatch dated New York, May 12, 1916, says: "Theodore Marburg, of Baltimore, formerly United States Minister to Belgium, at a dinner given by him here tonight to members of the League to Enforce Peace, told of an interview he had with Sir Edward Grey, in which the British foreign minister said that he was wholly in favor of the plan of the League to Enforce Peace. 'I found other leading men in

England quite in sympathy with President Wilson's aspiration for some sort of joint guarantee of peace on the part of the great nations. I found it was generally felt that the United States, which is the greatest example of a successful league of States, might properly take the initiative in this movement.

No responsible body of opinion in England desires the dismemberment of Germany. What the allies demand is that the German attitude should so change from the inside that the rest of the world can live with her comfortably. If a change does come in the German point of view, we can live and work with one of the most helpful and inspiriting countries of the world. And it is believed that, in such an event, Germany could be counted upon to join a league of nations organized for justice, and that out of justice would come peace.' "

A Change of Heart All Around.

A few comments on the preceding remarks may not be amiss. No doubt Germany, like all other nations, needs a change of heart in many respects. The question is which side should make the start—Germany or her prospective partners. To live comfortably with Germany will be the easiest thing in the world, if her neighbors will but recognize the fact that, as the most highly educated nation, making the best use of her land, taking the best care of her people, she is entitled to the permanent enjoyment of her present rank as one of the leading powers. England, owning an empire more than four times the size of the United States, has enough land; in fact Mr. Asquith said that she has no desire to acquire more. Russia, nearly three times the size of the United States, has enough land; Tsar Nicholas I said so long ago. France, with a colonial domain one-and-a-half times the size of the United States, has enough land to assure her continuance as a great power. Germany, having hardly any colonies fit for white settlement, must inevitably

decline from her rank as a great power, unless she acquires a wider sphere of influence. If there are in the Old World any backward countries that need the uplifting influence of a strong, vigorous, civilized nation, nothing can be plainer than that they should be conceded to Germany as her sphere of influence. If the German government takes better care of its people than any other government, as is universally admitted, what better luck could befall any backward, neglected, ill-treated people than to come under the influence of such a government? Do this justice, and "out of justice will come peace." Admit Germany's claim to an adequate sphere of influence to insure her permanent rank as a great power, and she will be the most comfortable neighbor to live with. To understand what the denial of that claim means to her, all you have to do is to imagine yourself in her place and picture to yourself what your feelings would be. Would you not feel compelled to remain armed to the teeth in order to escape vassalage? Could you adopt any other policy than the one which you call militarism?

There is ample evidence to show that this situation is well understood by the leading statesmen in Britain, and that they would gladly admit Germany's claim, were they not afraid of being overshadowed by her. That fear would be dispelled by Anglo-American reunion. If this were offered, Britain would at once give Germany a free hand.

Albert Johnson's Work.

On August 30, 1913, nearly a year before the war, Hon. Albert Johnson of Washington advocated the same Quadruple Alliance.

"To attempt to unite all the white nations at once would needlessly complicate a task which will prove sadly complicated even in its simplest form. The initial combination must be just large enough to be predominant, but not larger than necessary, lest it lose its cohesion and become impotent

through the internal strains peculiar to every political structure before it gets into the habit of acting as a unit. A trust of civilization, consisting of Britain, France, Germany, and the United States, would suffice to break the deadlock which paralyzes Europe and to replace it by an effective concert based on common interests, and magnetic enough to secure the virtual union of the entire white race in the near future. It would at once constitute that international executive power which is the only means to insure universal peace, the early cessation of the growth of armaments, and their gradual reduction till they shall be just sufficient to keep the executive power securely predominant.

We poke fun at the people who say *mañana*. Let us not say it ourselves. A stitch in time saves nine.

We can increase our navy fivefold without the expenditure of a cent, by simply annexing the British, German and French navies. We can have an army of two millions on a peace footing and an army of eight millions on a war footing at no cost to ourselves, simply by making the German, French, and British armies coalesce with our own.

If you will take the trouble of looking into the matter you will find that the defensive union of the four most advanced nations is entirely feasible. It is simply a matter of a few compromises for the advantage of everyone concerned, compromises which have already won the approval of the best thinkers in Britain, France, and Germany. Everything depends on the first step, and that step we can take.

Thousands of people all over the globe are studying night and day how to solve the problem of universal peace. Here is a way—the surest way—probably the only way; at any rate the way in which all existing peace has been brought about: By the consolidation of the existing areas of internal peace, a consolidation which in the past was accomplished for the most part by conquest, in a few cases by voluntary union under external pressure. One more consolidation and the area of internal peace will become worldwide. Any one

can see that the four great powder-making nations, the four great gun-making, machine-using, coal-mining, shipbuilding, money-owning, technically trained nations, representing probably nine-tenths of the world's industry, would together constitute such an overwhelming power as to make war henceforth impossible. It would mean the almost immediate arrest of armaments and their gradual reduction to a mere fraction of their present size. Not only would our insurance policy cost us nothing, but it would greatly reduce our present expenditure."

First Kill, Then Resurrect.

Our offer of an alliance would be an event of first magnitude, and make a worldwide impression. When the public in Britain, France, and Germany are thus informed that they can have perpetual peace and perpetual supremacy over the globe, on condition that they become allies, they will not commit the absurdity of insisting that they must first crush their future allies in order afterward to resurrect them and ask them to be their friends.

Birds of a Feather.

To discuss the conditions of peace would be premature. Two conditions, however, are so essential to the permanence of peace that the opportunity of calling attention to them must not be neglected.

To restore such an artificial political structure, such an apple of discord, as the kingdom of Belgium, merely to keep up the name, would be a monumental absurdity. If King Albert must have a kingdom, let him be king of Poland, with three times as many subjects as he had before. The French-speaking Belgians wish to be French; let them be French. They cut loose from Holland in 1830 for the express purpose of joining France, and would have done so but for British

opposition. The Dutch-speaking Belgians wish to be Dutch; let them be Dutch. According to the "Vlaamsche Volksraad," their slogan is "Weg med Belgenland! Leve de Scheiding!" (Away with Belgium! Cheers for separation!) If Flemish Belgium, with the Belgian Congo, be allowed to combine with Holland into a Greater Netherlands, united with Germany in a customs union, Britain will not feel that a pistol is pointed at her heart from Antwerp. Germany, on the other hand, can calmly wait till Greater Netherlands, as genuinely German as Germany herself, grows tired of her separation from the rest of Germandom, and till Britain, under the sedative influence of the Quadruple Alliance and of Anglo-American reunion, recovers from her nervous alarms at Germany's supposed designs, and returns to her millennial affection for the "Older England." This, therefore, is an arrangement to which both parties can safely agree. Render unto France the things that are French, and unto Holland the things that are Dutch.

The restoration of the old boundaries in the Balkans would be another absurdity. Europe has been sitting on a volcano for a century because the various fragments of each Balkan nationality were by force prevented from uniting. The volcano is now extinct; why should it be rekindled? The world war arose from the efforts of the five fragments of the Serbian nation to attain their union. They have now attained it; let them keep it. All the Serbian-speaking lands have been absorbed by Austria-Hungary. As an autonomous kingdom within that Monarchy, Greater Serbia, under Prince Mirko of Montenegro, the pet of Vienna, would be as content as Pennsylvania is within the United States, and would not clamor for independence any more than Pennsylvania does. Smaller Serbia was a firebrand; Greater Serbia will be a bulwark of peace. Whoever insists on the restoration of the kingdoms of Serbia and Montenegro, with their old unnatural boundaries and their fictitious independence, proves that he is a doctrinaire who cares more for a name than for the people who bear that name.

The Roumanian nation, too, might find its long-sought national unity as an autonomous state within the future Austro-Hungarian confederation, King Ferdinand becoming king of Dacia (Hungary-Roumania).

Progress has been essentially a process of concentration, the change from indefinite, incoherent homogeneity to definite, coherent heterogeneity, the consolidation of many small political units, with fictitious home rule, into a few large ones, enjoying true home rule. The day of small unconfederated nationalities, like the day of the hand loom, is past.

No Return to Monarchy.

Anglo-American reunion does not mean the resumption of allegiance to a king. It simply means a federation of the English-speaking nations for common defense, each member being left as independent in its internal affairs as before. We should not be called upon to share in the administration of Britain's colonies any more than Canada is called upon today. Since Canada and the United States together number more than twice as many inhabitants as the rest of the English-speaking countries, it is evident that the center of the Anglo-Saxon (or rather Celtanglian) Federation, the meeting-place of the Celtanglian Congress or Parliament, would have to be on the Western Hemisphere.

Ireland the Peer of England and America.

As Newfoundland would no doubt for this purpose be included with Canada, the Celtanglian Federation would at present consist of six self-governing nations: the United Kingdom, the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa. However, the Federation can hardly come into existence, nor work smoothly, unless provision be made for a seventh member, of equal rank with the others, to wit, Ireland. It is not likely that the Irish-Americans will con-

sent to a federation which would leave Ireland a mere appendage to Britain. On the contrary, if Ireland be admitted as the peer of the other six members, having no closer connection with Britain than with the United States, she will act as a most efficient cement of the whole structure, because the 16 million people of Irish blood in the United States and the British colonies would feel that their political union with the land of their fathers depended on its membership in the Celtanglian Federation. A hexarchy would suffer from chronic indigestion; a heptarchy could digest the earth. And yet it would be nothing else than Greater Britain.

(2) MAKE PEACE PERMANENT.

The union of the four freest, strongest, most enlightened and progressive nations would at once insure universal peace.

Force is the Guarantee of Peace.

All the peace that ever existed within any nation is compulsory; it would not last five minutes were it not for the presence of the executive power with its well-filled store of powder and ball. When the executive power of any nation is weak, there is constant danger of internal war. Similarly, permanent international peace is not possible without a strong, firmly-knit International Executive Power. The peace which till lately was well-nigh universal was the result of the progressive, forcible consolidation of many small nations into a few great nations. It was broken because each one of these great nations, seeing its future insecure, had to take advantage of every chance to make it secure, not only by strengthening its armament to the utmost, but also by checking the growth of its neighbors, which of course tended to make its neighbors' future more insecure and subjected them to the constant temptation to thwart the supposed conspiracy by armed force, while yet a chance

remained. The conclusion is evident. Let there be a final consolidation into a group so large as not to admit of a rival combination; let the consolidated nations thus assure their own future, making it advantageous for them to aid instead of checking one another, and enabling them to decide the claims of the unconsolidated nations on the sole ground of the best interest of humanity—and peace will be perpetual.

Not Too Many Cooks.

If the International Executive Power is not to become a powerless power through its own complexity and internal friction, it must not include more nations than will suffice to make it irresistible. The greater the number of participants, the greater will be the difficulty of reconciling their interests; the feebler will be the coherence; the greater the danger of rupture in time of stress.

Peace with Righteousness.

In order to have the best assurance that this Power will always be on the side of justice and progress, it must be composed of those governments that are responsible to the most enlightened, most humane constituencies, to whom the destinies of humanity may most safely be entrusted. There was peace within the Mongol empire in the 13th century, but it was a most unrighteous peace, making civilized people the helpless prey of barbarians.

Union of the Elite.

In order that the peace enforced by the Executive Power shall be eugenic, that is to say, tending to promote the spread of the superior human elements, and thus to fulfill the main condition of the increase of human happiness, the nations entering the combination, and made omnipotent

through union, must be the elite of humanity, so that, in seeking their own advantage, they shall best promote the interests of the race. The elite should be elite enough to hang together. Too often has the disunion of the superior elements subjected them to the inferior, which enjoyed union through their anti-eugenic capacity for submitting to despotism. A house divided against itself cannot stand, even though it be made of the finest material.

The Four-cornered House of Peace.

To state the above conditions is to name the only four nations that can fulfill them: Britain, France, Germany, and the United States. Evidently the alliance of these four great creditor nations would be strong enough to impose peace on the globe, and would be compelled by sheer regard for its financial interests to do so, when the four nations no longer try to check one another. It is highly fortunate that two of them, Britain and France, are already allied. This leaves only the reconciliation and alliance of Britain and Germany and of France and Germany to be accomplished. We can accomplish it by offering our alliance to all three.

A Growing Creed.

A predominant International Executive Power consisting of Britain, France, Germany, and the United States was advocated by Mr. Carnegie in his letter to the Boston Peace Congress, dated September 27, 1904. The same idea was advanced by Colonel Roosevelt in his Norway speech on May 5, 1910; by Admiral Wainwright in his address before the American Society for Judicial Settlement of International Disputes, December 21, 1912; and by Senator Lodge in his Schenectady speech of June 9, 1915.

“Nations must unite,” says Senator Lodge, “as men unite, to preserve peace and order. The great nations must be so

united as to be able to say to any single country, 'You must not go to war,' and they can only say that effectively when the country desiring war knows that the force which the united nations place behind peace is irresistible."

The program of the Navy League says that permanent peace is possible only through "the concentration of the preponderant military strength into the hands of the most pacific communities."

One of the most emphatic important utterances on this subject is that of Prof. Talcott Williams, Director of the Columbia University School of Journalism, in an address before the Panamerican Congress at Washington.

"A United States, armed and ready to act on new responsibilities and to play its part in the world's peace, can turn the world toward some agreement for the joint enforcement of international law, neutralization, and arbitration. An unarmed United States, not ready to discharge its duty to the peace of humanity, will be negligible in the new organization of Europe, or become its prey. With the armed force of European civilization, and one might add Asiatic, today divided into two opposing camps and commands, neither as yet visibly the victor, the question as to how an international tribunal can enforce its jurisdiction really turns in this situation on whether the United States, by arming, awaking to its duty, and changing its past policy, will become as efficient an instrument in the world's peace as does the good citizen when the sheriff calls."

"Until the greater countries, or a vigorous majority of the greater countries, agree to use force, neither international tribunals nor peace will be more than a dream, a vision, a kindly hope, a friendly desire, to be broken at any moment by brute force. Only a world force can bring world peace."

And the only way to create a reliable world force is to create it primarily not for the purpose of enforcing the world's peace, but for the members' own benefit; and to begin with those nations whose participation is absolutely

indispensable. Call in as many cooks as you must have, but no more.

The Rule of Benevolent Force.

In days of old, when knights were bold, and barons held their sway, every man went armed, knowing that, in the absence of a strong executive power, he might at any moment be attacked. Today, when the executive power is strong and vigilant, most men go unarmed, knowing that the chance of being attacked is too remote to justify the trouble of carrying arms. So long as we have no International Executive Power, every nation feels compelled to remain armed, not knowing how soon it may be attacked. When the smaller nations discover that the Quadruple Alliance means business, that it is a real International Executive Power, which will neither allow them to attack nor to be attacked, when they have by experience become convinced that they have nothing to fear from it so long as they remain at peace, they will quickly grow tired of their costly, useless armaments and will reduce or even abolish them. Thereupon the Quadruple Alliance could reduce its own armaments and still remain sufficiently predominant to insure the world's peace. It is even possible that the International Police might forbid the carrying of arms by individual nations, just as the municipal police forbids the carrying of arms by individuals, without special license. It has been estimated that one-tenth of the present armaments of the four leading nations would suffice to keep the globe at peace if that one-tenth were under single control and no rival armament in existence.

How to Crush Militarism.

That is the way to crush militarism—by abolishing the conditions which make it a necessity. So long as we have nearly a dozen big sticks, they are bound to grow bigger and

bigger; when we have only one big stick, it will quickly grow smaller. So long as we have an incoherent multiplicity of nations, they will have no choice but to arrange themselves in rival groups, so balanced in strength as to constitute a practical deadlock, each nation being meanwhile compelled to remain armed to the teeth in order to face the ubiquitous uncertainty and to make its alliance as valuable as possible. That is militarism—the “balance of power,” in other words, the lack of a Preponderant Power.

Banish the Uncertainty.

Break the balance of power; create the conditions which will enable the strongest nations to unite into an efficient concert, with no possible rival, a preponderant, irresistible, firmly coherent power, dispensing the highest kind of justice—and the uncertainty will be at an end; the temptation for the smaller nations to obtain advantages by force of arms will vanish. All the minor armaments will become useless and disappear, and then there will be no motive for an increase of the one remaining great armament, but every motive for its reduction. Pennsylvania and New York are not trying to rival each other in armaments. When time and the practice of co-operation shall have welded Britain, France, Germany, and the United States into a unit with a single soul, their separate armaments will insensibly coalesce into one, and their rivalry will cease.

Beware of Prenatal Asphyxia.

Even though the four governments mentioned are the most reasonable, most enlightened, best intentioned, and their real interests are least conflicting, nothing less than supreme wisdom and devotion will be needed to weld them together into an efficient, securely coherent International Executive Power. It were criminal folly to defeat the effort in advance, to stifle the infant before birth, by insisting that

less reasonable, less enlightened, less well-intentioned governments, with sharply conflicting interests, must be invited to take part in the initial combination. When you have barely enough cement, you cannot afford to mix clay with it.

The Suicide of Logic.

When a man advocates an International Executive Power on the ground that nothing but force will assure peace, and then insists that this Power must represent all nations, free and unfree, advanced and backward, enlightened and benighted, educated and illiterate, because otherwise it would embody the rule of force, he says yes and no to the same proposition at the same time. He takes a step forward, then steps back the same distance, and crows with joy to think how progressive he is, because he took two steps. It takes a genuine doctrinaire to invoke the name of force and the name of equality in the same breath. When the Quadruple Alliance is in assured working order as an International Executive Power, it will be time to consider the question of its enlargement through the admission of other self-governing, enlightened nations. We want a Power, not a Pandemonium; a combination of forces, not a deadlock, like the late lamented "concert of the powers." A dozen oars will not move a boat if six pull forward and six backward.

The Entering Wedge.

Make sure of the beginning, if you wish to reach the end. The way to split a log is to use an "entering wedge." The Romans gradually extended the privilege of Roman citizenship till it finally was granted to all the inhabitants of the empire; if they had made it a rule to grant it to every province before it was accustomed to Roman rule, there would have been no Roman empire, no *Pax Romana*.

The Cement Will Set.

The United States is a standing proof of the practicability of an Anglo-Franco-German-American alliance. Our area is equal to that of Europe, and our population, now 100 millions, will soon be 263 millions, the present aggregate population of the proposed combination; yet we feel absolutely sure that our nation will remain as firmly united then as now. Were the Quadruple Alliance once started, the daily enjoyment of its omnipotence would soon give it the permanence of a law of nature. "It is only the first step that costs," says the French proverb. "Put Germany in the saddle; she will ride all right," said Bismarck to the gloomy prophets who predicted that Germany, even if once patched together, would fall to pieces again.

"Habit is an iron shirt," says the German proverb. Let the wisest nations for once be wise and energetic enough to cast off the iron shirt of disunion, and they will soon be wearing the iron shirt of union.

The Paramount Interest.

Just as eugenics is the paramount condition of progress, so the union of the elite is the paramount condition of eugenics. Little will it profit to find out what human types have the best claim to survive, if meantime through their cursed disunion they lose the power to enforce their claim. Today the progressive elements, by simply uniting, can become omnipotent, for their own and humanity's greatest advantage. If they throw away the opportunity, the forces of reaction may grasp it and initiate an era of anti-eugenics, an era of stagnant misery.

"Ill fared it then with Roderick Dhu
That on the field his targe he threw."

Eighteen hundred years ago, Tacitus, the Roman his-

torian, speaking of the Britons, expressed his astonishment at the strange perversity of human nature which leads nations to continue their quarrels, even when the common enemy is at the door:

“Nec aliud adversus validissimas gentes pro nobis utilius quam quod in commune non consulunt. Rarus duabus tribusve civitatibus ad propulsandum commune periculum conventus; ita, dum singuli pugnant, universi vincuntur.”

(In our contests with the most valiant nations nothing is more useful to us than the fact that they do not act together. Only in rare cases do two or three nations combine to ward off the common danger; and thus, as they fight each by itself, they are conquered one by one.)

The same warning is daily repeated in the press of Britain, France, Germany, and the United States. When will it be heeded?

On reading the story of the wars between Athens and Sparta, which led to the ruin of both, one instinctively exclaims: “The unspeakable fools! Why hadn’t they sense enough to combine and rule the earth?”

Why haven’t we sense enough to do it now?

Self-debrutalization.

All past consolidations of small nations into large nations were made for selfish purposes, mostly for the aggrandizement of brutal conquerors. In the face of passing events, it would be a burlesque to assert that the day of selfishness in international relations is past. Ten thousand cannon are telling us that international agreements to maintain the world’s peace cannot be safely trusted to bear the test of trial in time of stress, unless they are primarily designed to promote the self-interests of the contracting parties. Some people call this a shocking doctrine. The remark is bitterly true. It is shocking to find humanity so little raised above the brute. But nothing is to be gained by ignoring that

fact, and not much more is to be gained by lamenting or denouncing it. The wise, manly thing to do is to take advantage of it, just as you take advantage of any other force of nature. Use the stumbling-block as a stepping-stone. Make brutality turn the handle of the very machine which shall grind and sift the brute out of man. Induce the four leading nations to conclude an alliance for their own selfish interests, and they will be compelled by their very selfishness to render to humanity the service of establishing that permanent peace which is needed to give freer play to the unselfish instincts and to limit the scope of the selfish instincts.

Fill Our Arsenals.

If this policy were adopted, the immediate stoppage of the war or an immediate embargo on exports of munitions need not throw a single workman out of employment. The ammunition which we now manufacture for foreigners would be manufactured for ourselves. The value of our alliance will be quoted in the market in accordance with the state of our arsenals. By keeping all our ammunition at home, we shall greatly add to the eloquence of our plea for peace.

Congressman Gardner on July 29 declared in the House of Representatives that the British had used in one day for the Somme advance more field artillery ammunition than the entire supply of the United States. At the present rate of appropriations for field artillery ammunition, he said, it would require eleven or twelve years to acquire sufficient ammunition to supply the needs of the army for the early months of a possible war. This means, of course, that in case of war with a great power we should be defenseless until we had accumulated sufficient ammunition, and the question at once arises whether the enemy would give us time to do that. The grotesque thing is that we are probably manufacturing enough ammunition in a month to last us for the first three months of a possible war, but all this goes

abroad. If we are really in earnest about preparedness, the first common-sense measure would be an embargo on exports of ammunition, coupled with a proviso that the United States government will assume the remainder of the pending contracts.

That kind of preparedness ought to commend itself to the labor unions. One reason why these unions oppose military preparation is the fear that a large standing army, when once at the disposal of the government, would be used not only for foreign war but also for repressing popular movements. Evidently the accumulation of ammunition would have no such effect, while the manufacture of that ammunition would keep large bodies of workmen employed at remunerative wages.

So long as we keep up the policy of isolation, we have the technical right to sell ammunition to any one able to buy it, and according to the letter of neutrality it is none of our business to inquire whether both sides are able to buy. But if we decide to abandon the tradition of no alliances, it would be a flagrant piece of effrontery to invite Germany to be our ally while we continue to furnish ammunition to her enemies.

This is 1916, Not 1796.

When an alliance with our three parent nations is the only avenue to permanent peace and to the conservation of our paramount interest, what shall we say of the man who at one and the same time clamors for peace and against "entangling alliances?" He cuts off his nose to spite his face. He pins to his coat the badge of insincerity. He says, "We must swim, but we must not go into the water." A doctrine has neither meaning nor value except what it derives from the purpose on which it is based. The purpose of Washington's warning against entangling alliances in 1796 was to avoid war. So long as the doctrine served that purpose, it was good. When it defeats that purpose, it becomes bad.

No one who has studied the character of Washington can doubt that, if he were alive today, he would be the foremost advocate of our participation in the Quadruple Alliance. The grown man would look ridiculous in the go-cart which afforded safety to his baby steps.

The Letter That Killeth.

By offering reunion to Britain, on condition that France and Germany be included, we are sure of banishing war not only from our own country, but from the globe. If we deny to our harassed brothers the boon of that initiative which we can give so easily; if we refuse to organize the most progressive elements of mankind, our own kindred and natural friends, into an International Executive Power to control the world's destinies for the world's greatest good; if we worship the letter which killeth, while we blaspheme the spirit which giveth life—we are by no means sure of a better chance of remaining at peace; on the contrary, our very lack of allies, the very lack of organization among our kindred, may before long expose us to a horrible war. To cling to our traditional aloofness simply because it is the tradition, would be to shirk our manifest duty. To proclaim our yearning for peace, and then, for the sake of a "doctrine," refuse to create the agency which alone can establish peace, would be to notify the world that we do not mean what we say.

We cannot cut loose from our past. We are simply Europeans, born or naturalized in America. Blood is thicker than geography. My brother remains my brother, even when he moves to the antipodes; the stranger remains a stranger, even though he lives next door.

A Disentangling Alliance.

An alliance with one nation would indeed be entangling. An alliance with the three strongest nations, our own near-

est kin and natural friends, would not be entangling, but disentangling. It would be our strongest conceivable armament, rendering us absolutely secure against attack. To neglect that armament would be to throw away our best chance of safety.

A Decaying Tradition.

"It is an ill wind that blows nobody good." The greatest of all calamities has had at least one good effect; it has awakened many Americans to the perception that the deaf, blind, unreasoning tradition of "no alliances" would be a crime, did we not know that it is simply the effect of the inattention common even among the most advanced human types.

"If we are not willing to urge our own government to join a movement for peace," says President Lowell, of Harvard University (World Peace Foundation, 40 Mount Vernon St., Boston, Pamphlet Series, October, 1915), "we have no business to discuss any plan for the purpose. It is worse than futile, it is an impertinence, for Americans to advise the people of Europe how they ought to conduct their affairs if we have nothing in common with them; to suggest to them conventions, with burdens which are well enough for them, but which we are not willing to share. If our peace organizations are not prepared to have us take part in the plans they devise, they had better disband, or confine their discussions to Pan-American questions.

Would it be wise for the United States to make so great a departure from its traditional policy? The wisdom of consistency lies in adherence to a principle so long as the conditions upon which it is based remain unchanged. But the conditions that affect the relation of America to Europe have changed greatly since 1796. At that time it took about a month to cross the ocean. Ships were small and could carry few troops. Their guns had a short range. No

country had more than what would now be called a very small army; and it was virtually impossible for any foreign nation to make more than a raid upon our territory before we could organize and equip a sufficient force to resist, however unprepared we might be at the outset. But now, by the improvements in machinery, the Atlantic has shrunk to a lake, and before long will shrink to a river. Except for the protection of the navy, and perhaps in spite of it, a foreign nation could land on our coast an army of such size, and armed with such weapons, that unless we maintain troops several times larger than our present forces we should be quite unable to oppose them before we had suffered incalculable damage.

It is all very well to assert that we have no desire to quarrel with any one, or any one with us; but good intentions in the abstract, even if accompanied by long-suffering and a disposition to overlook affronts, will not always keep us out of strife. When a number of great nations are locked in a death grapple, they are a trifle careless of the rights of the bystander. * * * Except by colossal self-deception we cannot believe that the convulsions of Europe do not affect us profoundly; that wars there need not disturb us; that we are not in danger of being drawn into them; or even that we may not some day find ourselves in the direct path of the storm. If our interest in the maintenance of peace is not quite so strong as that of some other nations, it is certainly strong enough to warrant our taking steps to preserve it, even to the point of joining a league to enforce it. The cost of the insurance is well worth the security to us.

If mere material self-interest would indicate such a course, there are other reasons to confirm it. Civilization is to some extent a common heritage which it is worth while for all nations to defend, and war is a scourge which all people should use every rational means to reduce. If the family of nations can, by standing together, make wars less frequent, it is clearly their duty to do so, and in such a body we do not want the place of our own country to be vacant."

Still more forcible is an utterance in *The New Republic*, November 20, 1915, page 58:

"The greatest obstacle is the American tradition of national isolation—the sense that by committing ourselves to European responsibilities we should be surrendering something essential and noble in our heritage of democracy. This tradition is the enemy which must be exposed and exterminated, for unless it is exterminated we shall have misinterpreted the chief lesson of the war and permitted the nation to continue a policy of suicidal exclusiveness. * * * There can be no permanent security unless the pacific nations are welded into an organization sufficiently tough, alert, clear-headed, and well equipped to make their joint power count decisively in the balance against an aggressive disturber of the peace."

To repeat, lest we forget: We are simply Europeans, born or naturalized in America. We are a great, rich, orderly, civilized nation because we are Englishmen, Welshmen, Scotchmen, Irishmen, Frenchmen, Germans, Dutchmen, Scandinavians.

A Civilization-wide Constitutional Convention.

On November 18, 1915, at the annual banquet of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, Mr. Darwin P. Kingsley delivered an address, "Democracy *vs.* Sovereignty," which is perhaps the most logical bit of reasoning that has appeared during the war, and ought to be read by every sincere American patriot.

"We should signify our willingness," he says, "to meet representatives of all the considerable powers of the world in an International Congress, the purpose of which shall be similar to that of the convention which met in Philadelphia in 1787. We should in that Congress stand for the civilizing and humanizing of international relations by whatever steps may be necessary. If as a nation we must

surrender what each colony seemed to surrender in 1789, we should stand for that. We should find when the time came—as our fathers did—that we had actually surrendered only a little false pride, a little hate, a little prejudice and a little fear, and had entered, as the Colonies did, upon the only order that leads to peace and true greatness. We shall not, of course, reach the ultimate goal at one bound. A world state modeled after our Federal Constitution may be a long way off, but a real beginning would be a transcendent achievement.

If we now arm—as we should—and do only that, we shall show ourselves a nation of ingrates. If we arm and say to Europe that we are ready at any time to disarm, ready with them to create an international state, a state in which international questions shall be settled as our interstate questions are, a state in which war would ultimately become as impossible, as unthinkable as it now is between Massachusetts and New York—if we try to do that, we shall show ourselves morally at least to be worthy descendants of the intrepid men who signed the Declaration of 1776, worthy successors of the great democrats who fashioned the charter of our liberties in 1787."

A word of comment on these resolute utterances may not be inappropriate. The thirteen colonies had for 150 years lived a common life as dependencies of the same mother country, and until 1775 no thought of separate existence had entered their minds. They had won their freedom together, had lived 12 years in at least technical union, and had made treaties as one nation. Their language, laws, habits and traditions were practically the same, and their real and imaginary interests were more nearly alike than those of any other group of states in history. They had never spoken of one another as "hereditary enemies," nor learned to consider the epithets "false," "perfidious," almost as integral parts of their neighbors' names. Yet with all this, as Mr. Kingsley himself points out, the Federal Union

came within an inch of being rejected. Had an attempt been made to include other states, with different language, laws, traditions and interests—say Canada, Cuba and Mexico, supposing that these had been free—their failure to federate would have become a certainty.

A more impressive lesson of the stubbornness of human nature can hardly be imagined. This is the lesson that we shall have to bear in mind if we wish to make progress in the work of world federation. If all the nations are to be invited to the first World Constitutional Convention, it is bound to be a failure, or only a nominal success. If we wish to build up a solid super-nation—as Edward D. Page calls it—strong enough to enforce the world's peace, we must invite only those nations whose real or imaginary interests are most nearly identical, and even of these nations we must not try to include more than will suffice to make their united strength securely preponderant over any conceivable counter-combination.

Britain, France, Germany and the United States united would be securely and permanently predominant and thus be enabled and compelled to enforce peace. These four will suffice; less than these four will not suffice. Their interests and traditions are more nearly alike than those of any other nations, but of course far less so than were the interests and traditions of the thirteen colonies. If the colonies, with far more pressing need of union, and long trained in the habit of union, nevertheless came within an inch of disruption, it may be imagined how difficult it will be to unite four nations long separated by hereditary animosities. Ponder over this a moment and you will see that the proposal to include more than four nations in the initial combination, and thus to insure the failure of the effort, would be nothing less than insanity.

President Wilson in Favor of an Alliance.

The following extracts from President Wilson's speech before the League to Enforce Peace, on May 27, 1916, show that he is willing to bid goodby to the traditional policy of no alliances.

"The longer the war lasts the more deeply do we become concerned that it should be brought to an end. And when it does come to an end, we shall be as much concerned as the nations at war to see peace assume an aspect of permanence, give promise of days from which the anxiety of uncertainty shall be lifted.

We are participants, whether we would or not, in the life of the world. The interests of all nations are our own also. We are partners with the rest. What affects mankind is inevitably our affair as well as the affair of the nations of Europe and of Asia.

Repeated utterances of the leading statesmen of most of the great nations now engaged in war have made it plain that their thought has come to this, that the principle of public right must henceforth take precedence over the individual interests of particular nations, and that the nations of the world must in some way band themselves together to see that the right prevails against any sort of selfish aggression; that henceforth alliance must not be set up against alliance, understanding against understanding, but that there must be a common agreement for a common object, and that at the heart of that common object must lie the inviolable rights of peoples and of mankind.

This is undoubtedly the thought of America. That thought constitutes a chief part of the passionate conviction of America.

So sincerely do we believe in these things that I am sure that I speak the mind and wish of the people of America when I say that *the United States is willing to become a partner in any feasible association of nations* formed in

order to realize these objects and make them secure against violation.

But I did not come here to discuss a program. I came only to avow a creed and give expression to the confidence I feel that the world is even now upon the eve of a great consummation, when some common force will be brought into existence which shall safeguard right as the first and most fundamental interest of all peoples and all governments, when coercion shall be summoned not to the service of political ambition or selfish hostility, but to the service of a common order, a common justice, and a common peace."

Views of Senator John Sharp Williams.

Commenting on the preceding speech, Senator John Sharp Williams remarked as follows:

"President Wilson's suggestions, in line with those of the League to Enforce Peace, do and do not conflict with Washington's farewell advice against 'entangling alliances.'

A compact of nations, agreeing to use force against an international disturber of the peace, certainly is an alliance with unmistakable entanglements, but it is not the sort of alliance Washington had in mind. Washington thought of such alliances as where nations A, B, and C joined for selfish purposes against nations D and E, perhaps to prosecute the pet wars of hereditary lines of princes.

Were Washington standing in Wilson's place today he would see the wisdom of joining national action against international brawlers."

Arm to Disarm.

So long as the Quadruple Alliance is not yet a fact, it will indeed be good policy to adopt the most thoroughgoing program of "preparedness," as the indispensable means to make our alliance valuable enough to our prospective partners, in particular, to convince Britain that Anglo-American reunion

would indeed mean the perpetual security of the British empire. However, as soon as the scare created by the war has subsided, as soon as the Quadruple Alliance is in working order, and has tasted the luxury of omnipotence; as soon as the world has grown fond of the comfort of being ruled by the elite, we should have no cogent motive to retain the enlarged army and navy. Our three prospective partners are amply equipped to keep the globe quiet if they can be united. All that is required of us is that we take the initiative toward their union, an initiative which for them would be a superhuman task, for us a mere matter of the slight effort to open our eyes to our own glaring advantage.

True Americanism.

In a word, the greatest opportunity in all history is knocking at the door of the United States—the opportunity to bestow eternal peace on mankind, and thus to gain the permanent place of honor among the nations. If our statesmen fail to perceive their duty, they will become responsible for an unsightly blot on our national record. It would be nothing less than treason to humanity—treason to our own most sacred interests. The highest duty, the highest honor of every nation, consists in rendering the greatest possible service to humanity. Sham Americanism says, “Am I my brother’s keeper?” To make America supreme among the nations, through supreme service rendered, is the truest Americanism.

Ask the People.

The issue thus presented is so momentous that our legislators will hardly deem their powers adequate to deal with it. Nothing less than an appeal to the court of last resort, the American people, will afford a safe basis of action. In view of the sincerity and high sense of honor which the majority of American voters have shown on innumerable occasions,

they surely deserve to be consulted on this most important of all questions. No patriot will be content to see his countrymen defrauded of the priceless opportunity which is rightfully theirs. To refuse to submit this question to them on the ground that they are not intelligent or high-minded enough to vote in the affirmative would be to insult the American people. Let us have a little modesty, and confess that not one of us is smart enough to know what the American people think until we ask them and receive their answer.

Armistice, the Sooner the Better.

The preparations for this popular vote would of course require considerable time, during which the horrible slaughter would continue. What is needed is an act of statesmanship which will lead to an early armistice. It is in the power of Congress to render this inestimable service to humanity by simply adopting a resolution somewhat as follows:

Proposed Resolution.

Resolved, etc., That it is desirable to have a popular vote on the following question:

Shall the United States, after the present European war, offer to conclude a defensive alliance with Britain, France, and Germany?

No Risk.

By referring the question to the people for decision, Congress would assume the minimum of responsibility, and yet the mere passage of the resolution would suffice, because it would assure full discussion, and the result of a popular vote after adequate discussion can hardly be doubted by any one who has the least faith in human nature.

Create the Occasion for Mediation.

Within a short time the trend of American opinion would be sufficiently known to justify the belligerents in concluding an armistice. For that matter, the passage of the resolution would by itself create the opportunity for mediation, which might result in an immediate armistice.

Summary and Supplement.

Until within a few hundred years war was almost universal and chronic. During the past century peace has been almost universal. How did the change come about? Not through voluntary agreements among the nations, but through the consolidation of thousands of small nations into a few large ones, each with a strong executive power maintaining internal peace. Let this process be carried to its conclusion, and eternal peace is assured. If we are as civilized, as practical, energetic, public-spirited as we claim to be, the final consolidation will be voluntary, not compulsory. Let the wisest and strongest of the great nations consolidate into one overwhelming, irresistible power, and they will be able to forbid war among other nations, and will be compelled by self-interest to forbid it, when they no longer stand in each other's way.

And the nation which shall prove its superior wisdom by taking the lead in this movement will be the Queen of Nations for all time to come.

We have as yet no science of peace, though the elements of it are in existence, scattered through works on ethics, history, and especially political economy and sociology. By summarizing this material, some sociologist may at any moment win immortal fame as the founder of the science

of peace. Its leading idea will doubtless be that of a final consolidation. It may not be premature to sketch a tentative outline of such a science, as applied to the present situation.

The Science of Peace in Twenty Theorems.

1. Mediation in the present European war would be little more than a formality unless a plan were presented which would make it safe for the combatants to stop fighting.
2. Lasting peace is inconceivable without an irresistible power to enforce it.
3. In order that peace may be a blessing, this power must consist of the freest, most enlightened, and humane nations.
4. In order to be efficient, that power must be large enough to be irresistible, but not so large, in its initial stage, as to be paralyzed and disrupted by conflicting interests.
5. International agreements aiming to maintain the world's peace cannot be safely trusted to bear the test of trial in time of stress, unless they are primarily designed to promote the self-interests of the contracting parties. Common interests, not mere papers, must be the connecting links.
6. The true self-interests of Britain, France, Germany, and the United States, the four strongest, freest, most enlightened, and humane nations, are most nearly identical and therefore most apt to be promoted by union, being at the same time most nearly identical with the best interests of all humanity. Britain and Germany, in the spring of 1914, had in fact concluded that their interests were identical, and they were on the point of coming to an agreement when the war broke out.
7. A league of these four nations, though primarily designed for their own benefit, would by its overwhelming strength be enabled, and by sheer self-interest be compelled, to act as an International Executive Power enforcing the world's peace.
8. Not one of the four nations can be omitted. Unless

Britain were reinforced by the United States, she would feel that in an Anglo-Franco-German alliance she would soon be overshadowed by Germany. The German-Americans will not consent to an alliance with Britain unless Germany be included; neither will the other Americans consent to an alliance with Germany unless Britain and France be included. Moreover, Britain could not desert her best friend for her present enemy. A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush.

9. Every well-wisher of Britain and France ought to consider that, by opposing an alliance with Germany, he would forego the pleasure of political union with Britain and France and deprive them of the security which our alliance would offer; every well-wisher of Germany ought to consider that, by opposing an alliance with Britain and France, he would forego the delight of reunion with the Fatherland and rob her of what may be her last chance of assuring her continuance as a great power.

10. Were this Quadruple Alliance once started, the daily enjoyment of its omnipotence would soon cause it to grow into a habit having the permanence of a law of nature. The cement will set.

11. The consolidation even of the four nations whose participation is essential, and whose interests are easiest to reconcile, will be a task of almost superhuman difficulty. It were folly to increase the risk of failure by attempting to include in the initial union other nations, whose participation is not indispensable and whose interests are more difficult to reconcile.

12. It is practically certain, however, that this Quadruple Alliance, when once in working order, would promptly be joined by the Scandinavian states and probably by other equally free and enlightened states.

13. The offer of our alliance would not be worth much to the other nations unless we possessed an adequate armament.

14. The prospect of an alliance for mutual benefit between Britain, France, Germany, and an adequately-armed United States would suggest to the belligerents a possibility of withdrawing from the conflict with mutual advantage and would thus constitute the best preparation for early and effective mediation.

15. To put the case in a nutshell, if Britain and Germany can be made to enter into partnership, the world's peace is forever secure. They will do so when the United States, equipped with an adequate armament, offers her alliance to both, thus assuring their future safety.

16. By this plan the strongest immediate armament would become the best assurance against its actual use, and the surest, safest, shortest, cheapest road to a gradual reduction of armaments to the minimum compatible with the maintenance of an irresistible International Executive Power. Arm to disarm.

17. It is practically certain that the responsibility imposed on us by our participation in this combination would be merely nominal, since the other three nations are amply equipped to keep the globe at peace as soon as they are united. All we have to do is to unite them by offering our well-armed alliance to all three.

18. This voluntary alliance with our three parent nations would thus be not entangling but disentangling, affording us perpetual security and important national advantages at little cost, and probably relieving us of the future necessity of seeking alliances, which in time of embarrassment we could not obtain without severe sacrifices.

19. The initiative in this matter is easy for the United States and almost impossible for any other nation. Hence it is our duty.

20. It would be an act of despotism to defraud the American people of their right to be heard on a matter of such supreme importance to them. Hence it should be submitted to their votes.

Eugenic Peace.

The present pamphlet was printed under the title of "Eugenic Peace" on October 28, 1915. In a subsequent issue the title was changed, several critics having pointed out that it might harm the cause, since eugenics is largely regarded as a fad. To hide the essential idea behind a less essential one seems a bit of cowardice, but most readers will admit that the present title is more useful for popular purposes.

To those who are familiar with the subject, the term "Eugenic Peace" is almost self-explanatory and self-demonstrative. Not many decades will pass before the name of Galton, the father of eugenics, will take rank among the most renowned in history, one of the most brilliant figures in Britain's hall of fame. Instead of being a fad, eugenics is the culmination of human intelligence. All movements, including the peace movement, are salutary or pernicious according as they do or do not conform to the principles of this master science. The reasoning is very simple.

National conduct, like individual conduct, is right or wrong according as it tends to increase or diminish human happiness. Human happiness depends mainly on the constitution of men themselves. For the purposes of society, men are superior or inferior according as their presence tends to raise or lower the general level of happiness. Hence the ultimate aim of true statesmanship must be to give to the superior types of men the best chance to spread.

In order to have the chance, they must have the power. The proverbial source of power is union. The way to get union is to make a beginning; to unite a number of superior human elements into a nucleus large enough to attract the rest. The only conceivable nucleus is one consisting of the British empire, France, Germany and the United States. These four would constitute an International Executive

Power strong enough to enforce perpetual, universal, eugenic peace.

Hence the Anglo-Franco-German-American alliance is the supreme need, to which everything else must be subordinated. It is the duty of the United States to take the initiative, because it is easy for us and almost impossible for the other three nations. If we take this initiative, our national conduct will be good; if we refuse, our national conduct will be bad.

Eugenics and Anti-eugenics.

The doctrine just set forth may be made clearer by contrast with its opposite.

In *The Empire Review* for April, 1916, the Honorable William Morris Hughes, Prime Minister of Australia, speaking of "the cancer of German influence in our trade and industry," and describing how "the entire fabric of British industry was being honeycombed by German enterprise" (it was no part of his thesis, of course, to describe how the entire fabric of German industry and of the industry of every country is honeycombed by British enterprise), says: "Let us of this great empire resolutely determine that, come what may, Germany shall never fatten upon our pastures. The world is wide; let her go where she will, trade with any, spy upon whom she pleases, but not with us." In the last paragraph he goes a step further: "If our allies follow our lead, as I believe they would, German credit and German confidence in ultimate victory would topple like a house of cards. As soon as the financiers, manufacturers and the people of Germany realized that the markets of the British empire and France and Russia were permanently closed against them, the bubble of their hopes would be burst, and confusion and dismay would spread through the land, dissensions honeycomb their political structure, and the specter of revolution rear his

sinister head. Let us then do this obvious, sensible and necessary thing."

Stripped of rhetoric, the "obvious, sensible and necessary thing" amounts to this:

"The Germans work harder than we do. If we do not want them to get ahead of us, we must do one of two things: either work as hard as they do, or prevent them from working so hard. We Britons should consider it plebeian to work harder than we now do, and moreover we need our time, attention and energy for the gentlemanly pursuits of cricket, fox-hunting and horse races; therefore we must prevent the Germans from working so hard. This we can do in two ways: (1) by preventing them from acquiring any more land to work on, (2) by agreeing with the other easy-working and less educated peoples not to buy anything from the Germans, nor allow them to make investments outside of their own land. It is a crime to work so hard, and we must punish them for it. Of course, in order to punish it, we must not call it work; we must call it militarism."

A more frankly anti-eugenic program cannot be conceived. It is enough to make Galton groan in his grave. Other things being equal, the hardest workers are the most desirable citizens and therefore have the best right to spread. Here is a man who deliberately plans to prevent the hardest workers from spreading, to punish them for working so hard.

His frankness becomes all the more amazing because of his outspoken admiration for Germany. He plainly tells his fellow-Britons that the German government is doing exactly what the British government ought to do, and that therefore the German government must be crushed. "The whole concept of modern statesmanship needs revision. But England has been, and is, the chief of sinners. * * * Germany is today the best organized nation in the world. And to this fact she owes her tremendous strength. She presents to the world the impressive spectacle

of a great nation whose myriad activities move in response to a settled purpose, to carry out which every individual in that great nation consecrates his whole energies and his life. There is no aimless rushing hither and thither, no dissipation of energy, no divided control or lack of control. There is one leader, and all men follow him. And the efforts of every individual are systematized; all are cogs in a monstrous and marvelously intricate machine, which moves as the supreme master wills. Every resource of science, of mechanical invention, has been organized. The ganglia of the national organism are highly developed, the correlation between them complete, the whole organism is streaked with nerve tissue. In short, Germany is an organized nation. Its efforts are systematized. Every man has his allotted task. They not only carefully avail themselves of the services of the highest scientific and expert minds, they create facilities by which these may achieve the best results. In Germany every need of the people is known, every means to supply it exploited. Before the war, every problem affecting industry, commerce, health, national safety, was systematically attacked by the best brains of Germany. The advance made by Germany during the last twenty-five years is the best proof of the value of her methods."

This eulogy (except the word "monstrous") sounds like another instance of England's reputed love of fair play, and the unsophisticated reader naturally expects to find the author proceeding somewhat in this fashion: "Since the German government takes better care of its subjects than any other government, it ought to have as many subjects as possible. If the governing bodies of other lands really have the welfare of their own people at heart, they ought to petition Germany to annex them. If we Englishmen are too proud to do that, let us at least do the next best thing: enter into the closest possible union with the 'Older England.' Let us tell our German brothers how proud we are to belong to the same race as they do. And since we

have enough land, let us afford to our progressive brothers every opportunity to extend their enlightening, stimulating influence over the remaining neglected countries. No better luck could befall the inhabitants of any country than to be taken under Germany's protection."

Great is the unsophisticated reader's astonishment on finding that the author has enumerated Germany's virtues merely as so many motives for crushing her. This superb ability which he describes, this public spirit, this self-control, this devotion to ideals, which is rejuvenating the world, and is held up by the author himself as a model for England to imitate, is in the next breath called "a cancer." Because England has hitherto been too lazy or too conceited to revise her concept of modern statesmanship, she is "the chief of sinners;" because Germany had intelligence enough to create the modern concept of statesmanship, and energy enough to adopt it, is she therefore the chief of saints? O, no; she is "a cancer." The nation which has banished illiteracy from her own land must not be allowed to educate the unfortunate inhabitants of the Near East; that task must be entrusted to a nation with 62 per cent of illiterates. All the backward nations must be invited by England to join her in an effort to stifle the most advanced nation, the nation that has developed the very policy which the author declares to be the best for every country, especially for his own. A truly noble work for England to undertake!

British statesmen constantly insist that they have none but the kindest intentions toward the German people; that they merely wish to crush the German government—the very government which, according to Mr. Hughes, takes the best care of its people. It appears that British statesmen expect the British public to believe that no harm will be done to the German people by shutting them out of the world's markets or by depriving them of the government which has made them the most educated, the most efficient nation in the world. If the British public do believe this—

and British statesmen may be assumed to know their audience—what must be the intellectual condition of the average Briton!

Fortunately, no one who knows anything of human nature or political economy will consider Mr. Hughes' program practicable. Its author will be the first to send it to the junk shop as soon as it has served its purpose as verbal artillery. Voices from Asia long ago notified the four million Australians that they have no right to keep a continent of three million square miles in a state of solitude while nine hundred million Asiatics are eager to colonize it. To keep Australia white (which can only be justified on the eugenic theory that the superior human types have the best right to spread) will require the strength of the united white race. Australians know that the attempt to split the white race and reinforce the yellow race, by driving the strongest and most energetic white nation into the arms of the Russo-Japanese alliance, would seal the fate of white Australia. Suppose Britain did succeed in crushing Germany; two years would not pass before she would be tortured by remorse.

“O my offense is rank; it smells to heaven!
It hath the primal, eldest curse upon it,
A brother's murder.”

“The obvious, sensible and necessary thing” for the British to do is to say to their hard-working German brothers: “We have enough land; you can have whatever remains.” Mr. Asquith did practically say this three years ago, and the only reason why Britain has hesitated to act up to it is because she feared that so hard-working and well-organized a people as the Germans would become predominant if allowed even the small sphere of influence still remaining for them. Remove that fear, by means of Anglo-American reunion, and Britain and Germany will instantly be allies, and Australia, Canada and the United States will forever remain white.

This, then, is at this moment the supremely needful aim of statesmanship. We of America can accomplish it by offering our alliance to both Britain and Germany. If we wish to assure our own most prosperous development, unhampered by the necessity of providing against attack; if we are sincere in our professed desire to bestow on mankind the blessing of perpetual righteous peace; if we wish to see America enthroned as Queen of the Nations for all time to come—"the obvious, sensible and necessary thing" for us to do is to invite Britain, France and Germany to join us in a Quadruple League of Civilization.

If we are not noble enough to take this initiative for the sake of humanity, let us at least have foresight enough to do it for the sake of avoiding our own ruin. If the nine hundred million people of Asia are freed from European control and armed as Japan is armed, they will inevitably demand unrestricted admission for their emigrants to all parts of the globe. No paper treaties, no school-made maxims of international law will avail against that elemental force. You might as well make a treaty with the Mississippi River or with the lava of Vesuvius. When the demand comes, backed by a navy six times stronger than ours, we shall vainly look for allies—unless we take care beforehand that all our possible allies shall not be ruined before our need arises. The only means to escape the coming doom is the union of the white race, and this will necessarily be of slow growth. A stitch in time saves nine. Start the Quadruple Alliance, and your own country will be safe forever. Those who try to hinder this work will not only be traitors to humanity, but traitors to their own country. Should they succeed in defeating "the obvious, sensible and necessary thing," their names will be cursed by their children and grandchildren.

OPINIONS.

(CONDENSED.)

I heartily endorse these aims, believing that only by the assumption of some responsibility for the welfare of the world can we escape the odium into which we are now rapidly advancing, of the man who grows rich on the calamity of his neighbors. I believe that a popular referendum would be wise and timely. So momentous a change in the traditional attitude of the United States can not be accomplished without country-wide agitation. Probably the method of the proposed joint resolution would be efficacious at home. It would also have a salutary effect abroad in counteracting the general impression that America has no policy save the most odious selfishness.—*B. W. Bacon*, Professor of New Testament Criticism and Exegesis, Yale University; Former Director American School of Archeology at Jerusalem.

I would welcome the proposed alliance between Britain, Germany, France and the United States. If carried out on the lines proposed, it could hardly fail to make for the peace of the world. But Britain and France are in no mood to consider the proposition. As for ourselves, we shall probably have to learn from bitter experience. I am sorry that I can not write more encouragingly for the realization of the admirable ideals embodied in the proposed resolution.—*Sylvester Baxter*, Secretary Metropolitan Improvement League, Boston, Mass.

The time is certainly ripe for us to reach some conclusion as to what part this country is to take in helping to police and regulate the intercourse among nations. No one could well dispute your proposition that the peace of the world is alone to be secured by a combination of the strong nations. That this can be accomplished is shown by the history of the United States. It was thought impossible to have a judicial system that would be satisfactory to the independent units which had combined. That such fears were groundless is proved by our experience. Why should not the same plan be extended among those nations that are now filled with the horrors of war, and must be convinced of the utter uselessness of war as a method of deciding questions among civilized nations?

We have been educated in a belief in the principle that we should avoid entangling alliances; but can this doctrine be applied as the world is now constituted? When we were a weak nation, hardly able to cope with our own difficulties, it was true that we were unable to take part in bringing about the settlement of the world's affairs; and as we were remote, we could well devote ourselves to the home government and not be molested by other nationalities. But neither of these reasons is now applicable. We could have the strength if we wanted to develop it, and we are no longer remote or uninfluenced by other nations. Should we then use this strength when we are convinced that it would be for the betterment of the world? With the power to do, there would seem to be coupled the obligation to take our part. Our ideals of our national life would seem to leave us no

alternative. If we conceive it as our high prerogative to unselfishly do that which shall inure to the benefit of the world, we must do our duty. We know that if improvement and struggle for better things is abandoned, it means deterioration. If our ideals mean anything, and are founded upon what is best for this country and for the world at large, we must try to force the lawless to respect them. Is it not equally true that all the protection of remoteness has now been dissipated? The experiences of this war have shown us that we cannot help being injured and the safety of our citizens put in jeopardy when other nations are fighting.

Should, then, the question be submitted to the people? Have they been educated up to the point where their answer would be one based on knowledge and not on the desire to stand by old ideas, and on the great temptation to do nothing and trust to luck for the future? I doubt whether the time is ripe for such a test. Should not the leaders take their course by the promptings of their own wisdom and experience and not be led by the inexperience of their constituents? The old doctrines emanated from and were maintained by the leaders and not by the voice of the people. Does it not hold true that the same course should be maintained when new duties require a modification of what our forbears thought expedient?—*Charles Biddle*, of Biddle, Paul & Jayne, Counsellors at Law and Proctors in Admiralty, 505 Chestnut street, Philadelphia.

Your plan is simplicity itself. An alliance between England and Germany would mean eternal peace. We can create it by offering our alliance to both. England could then afford to consent to every demand which Germany is likely to make, since it is evident that Germany could never become dangerous to the united English-speaking people. Germany will not make unreasonable demands. She merely wants to assure her own future, not to imperil her neighbors' future.

To us Californians this matter is of supreme importance because the alliance of the four leading nations means the union of the white race, which for us is the vital issue. The surrender of a British army to the Turks will be trumpeted through Asia as a victory of Asiatics over Europeans. It may lead to a revolt in India, which Britain would be unable to suppress. Mongolians and Hindus would thus be combined into a power of 815 millions, against whom it would be impossible in the long run to shut our doors. Nothing but the union of the white race could then prevent our Pacific Coast from becoming an Asiatic colony.

The loosened pebble starts the avalanche; stop the pebble, and there will be no avalanche. It is the duty of the entire white race to defend British rule in India; it is Britain's duty not to repel her would-be defenders by insisting that they shall resign themselves to slow degradation from the rank of a great power. Germany will gladly lend her aid for the defense of the British possessions, if Britain and the other white nations will but abandon the preposterous, pernicious claim that they, who have so much land, must acquire all the rest, while Germany, who has so little, must not acquire any. Britain owns more than four times as much land as the United States, Russia nearly three times as much, France more than one-and-a-half times as much, Germany only one-third as much, most of it unfit for white colonization. "You have taken all the meat, leave me at least the bones," says Germany. Surely the best-educated nation, who puts land to such good use, deserves to have the pitiful

remnant of territorial bones. As soon as Britain says yes, Germany will be her ally, and the white race will be united and forever secure. Britain will say yes as soon as she finds that it means Anglo-American reunion, which the German-Americans will never permit unless Germany be included.

"In union is strength." We repeat the proverb day after day with parrot-like monotony, yet when called upon to put it in practice, we act as if we had never heard it. In all the talk about "preparedness," not a word has been said about the strongest, cheapest of all armaments: union with those nations whose interests are identical with ours. History is an accumulation of proofs of the uselessness of martial skill, armament and bravery, unless these are backed by a firmly united population sufficient in numbers and resources. All the wealth, ability, and bravery of the ancient Greeks could not save them from the ruin which was the necessary consequence of their cursed disunion. So will the white race be ruined, unless it becomes united. A house divided against itself cannot stand.

Your plan is too precise, too definite, too simple, too logical, too sensible, too self-evident, to appeal to the multitude, who delight in mystery, vagueness and generality. It reminds me of a passage in Benjamin Franklin's autobiography. In 1754 he proposed a plan for the union of the colonies, which in his opinion would have prevented the disruption of the English-speaking people into two fragments. The British statesmen thought the plan "too democratic," while the American colonial assemblies saw in it "too much prerogative." Thereupon Franklin remarks:

"But such mistakes are not new; history is full of the errors of states and princes. Those who govern, having much business on their hands, do not generally like to take the trouble of considering and carrying into execution new projects. The best public measures are therefore seldom adopted from previous wisdom, but forced by the occasion."

Even with the terrible lessons of the past in full view, our statesmen may not have enough "previous wisdom" to adopt "the best public measure"—the union of the white race—but may postpone it till it is "forced by the occasion"—perhaps too late.

In a word, the introduction of your resolution would be the most important event in history. It is not to be expected that every Member of Congress will at once perceive its importance, but at least the Members from the Pacific Coast, and the representatives of organized labor, who have long been schooled in this line of thought, ought to rally to your support without a moment's hesitation.—*A. J. Boyer, Historian, California State Association of the District of Columbia, 1404 M Street, Washington, D. C.*

As an American by birth, of German ancestry on my father's side, and through my mother, descended from Scotch-English pre-revolutionary stock, I am naturally led by every impulse of sentiment to give unqualified assent to the plan. But in addition to the arguments advanced, there are some points which may well merit attention.

After the war, when England recognizes that it is impossible to eliminate Germany as a first-class power, she will find it to her interest to enter into an alliance with her, if only in order to counter-balance the Russo-Japanese alliance now evidently in process of formation. France would naturally be obliged to unite herself with the two Western powers, and there would thus arise two great groups of world-powers, the one having its predominant interests

centered in the Atlantic, the other looking for its future toward the Pacific.

The United States occupies a somewhat unique position, inasmuch as it is both an Atlantic and a Pacific power, and it might appear at first sight to be more advantageous for it to form a third great American group in conjunction with the South-American republics. But of these latter the most important have few interests in the Pacific. It would seem, therefore, both on this account and because of the close commercial connection between the United States and western Europe, which makes the former a predominantly Atlantic State, to be in accordance with the best interests of this country to join the British-German-French alliance. Not only would the United States be effectively protected by it from an attack on the Pacific side, but the resulting balance of power would be such that the danger of war would be almost entirely eliminated.

If this alliance is concluded between the three western European powers alone, it is very doubtful whether the United States would be in a position to demand admittance as a partner unless it takes the initiative in the matter, and it is quite possible that no invitation would be forthcoming. It is for this reason that I regard Mr. Stein's proposition as of such importance; if the United States has once gone on record in suggesting the alliance, it cannot be passed over later when the European powers come to an understanding. The United States does not thereby assume any obligation, and if the terms of the alliance should not meet with its approval, it could always withdraw.

Any other grouping of the western powers would be inadvisable. To include Russia would mean the injection into the alliance of purely Asiatic questions with which the Atlantic powers have no immediate concern, and the majority of Russian interests in Europe are in diametrical opposition to those of Germany and England. To exclude Germany, with or without the accession of the United States, would force the former to throw in her lot with the Pacific states, thereby augmenting their power in a menacing degree.

The smaller countries of Europe would naturally gravitate around the European alliance, but they would not necessarily be called upon to contribute their quota of armed forces, their independence being guaranteed by the alliance itself. This is an additional reason for restricting the primary alliance to the four Great Powers.

To those who fear the possible dangers involved in "entangling alliances," it may be answered that, while the obligations incurred by joining a purely defensive alliance designed solely for the preservation of peace might conceivably under certain circumstances demand the contribution of an armed force and thus bring about the very result that it was expected to prevent, any power or combination of powers bent on aggression that had become strong enough to risk an attack on the Quadruple Alliance would long before that have become a very serious menace to any isolated country.—*Rudolph E. Brünnow, Professor of Semitic Languages, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.*

I trust you will not hesitate to introduce the joint resolution. I would not subscribe to all of Robert Stein's proposals, but I heartily approve of the submission to the people of any general measures regarding alliances and conditions involving possible war.—*W. H. Carruth, Professor of Comparative Literature, Stanford University, California.*

The resolution indicates a policy which is emphatically in the right direction. The only permanent safeguard of peace must be a union of nations. I shall be sorry to see a referendum submitted to the people definitely specifying the countries, Britain, France, and Germany, as the countries with which the United States should conclude an alliance. It may or may not be practicable to bring these countries together in a single union, and it may be very necessary to include some other countries. If the list of countries specified in the referendum should fail to coincide with the list of countries which it is practicable and desirable to unite, the referendum would have to be disregarded. My judgment is that preliminary work must be in the direction of preparation for *some* league for ensuring peace.—*John Bates Clark*, Professor of Political Economy, Columbia University, New York; Director of Division of Economics and History, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

I have been slowly converted to a belief in armed peace. I am entirely in favor of alliances and attach no perennial significance to George Washington's famous dictum, despite the fact that it was plausible in his day.—*Herbert E. Cory*, Professor of English, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.

So far as at present advised, I can see no objection to providing a referendum in the matter, to be done at the time of a regular election.—*Charles B. Davenport*, Director, Station for Experimental Evolution of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, Cold Spring Harbor, Long Island, N. Y.

The only permanent safeguard of peace will be a union of nations, and in whatever form it comes, it must first be brought before the people. The above resolution would do this.—*Irving Fisher*, Professor of Political Economy, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

Any proposal to bring about effective co-operation between England, Germany and the United States deserves serious consideration. That these three chief powers of the western world should substitute co-operation for competition is a condition essential to the continuance of western civilization. Other nations may be included, but none of the three named can be excluded.

The United States should possess an armament proportioned to our need, not to our resources. The wealth and strength of the United States makes it unquestionably desirable that we be included in such an alliance, but this does not impose on us the necessity of matching our naval and military establishments with those of Great Britain and Germany.

The vote proposed is not provided for in our scheme of government. The adoption of such a joint resolution would impose no obligation on the several states to conduct such a referendum. Congress might advise the states to hold it, but I do not think it could do more.—*H. A. Garfield*, President Williams College, Williamstown, Mass.

A definite peace plan at last.—*James Geddes, Jr.*, Professor of Romance Languages, Boston University, Boston, Mass.

If the object could be accomplished without a referendum, it would be preferable, because the voters are not likely to have the time or the desire to inform themselves on so weighty a subject. I do not think, however, that there is any chance of getting Congress to take

the responsibility of so radical a departure from our time-honored policy except in response to a vigorous public demand. The only way to bring this demand into action is public discussion, and a referendum would evidently be the best method for that purpose.—*R. R. Gurley, M. D., 542 East 79th street, New York.*

I am an earnest advocate of honorable peace, and at the same time I am emphatically and irrevocably opposed to transferring the diplomatic duties and powers of the President of the United States, the Secretary of State and the Senate of the United States to one hundred million people who for the most part are and would be incapable of reaching any coherent or worthwhile opinion as to our foreign relations.—*General George H. Harries, President Omaha Electric Light & Power Co., Omaha, Neb.*

The proposed resolution in favor of an Anglo-Franco-German-American alliance ought to appeal to every man of German birth or descent, because it means Germanic union, the voice of blood which is supposed to be thicker than water. Often has that voice spoken in vain. Let us hope that it may this time be heeded.

When Belisarius started to attack the Vandals, a German tribe, he was aided by the Goths, another German tribe, who had a grudge against the Vandals. No sooner had he beaten the Vandals than he turned against the Goths and beat them. Had Goths and Vandals stood together, both would have been safe. As Macbeth says,

"Were they not forced with those that should be ours,
We might have met them dareful, beard to beard,
And beat them backward home."

The Goths were aware of their kinship with the Vandals and of their own precarious hold on Italy. They did not know that, in siding with the enemy against their kinsmen, they were committing treason against the Germanic race; the racial consciousness had not then attained that degree of development. But the unspeakable fools ought to have known that they were committing suicide, for the ruin of the Vandals left the Gothic kingdom at the mercy of Belisarius, whose name, by the way, is conjectured to have been Slavic, Belitsar meaning White Tsar.

Ever since England had a literature, her writers have been boasting of their German origin. They took pleasure in tracing their language, their laws, their parliament back to the forests of Germany. From that feeling of kinship, hardly less than from common interests, sprang the "historic alliance." On hundreds of battle-fields Englishmen and Germans have fought side by side; never until 1914 did they face each other as enemies, except when hired by strangers. Today every intelligent, fair-minded Englishman must be prouder than ever to think that he is of the same race as the Germans.

"We put our money on the wrong horse," was Lord Salisbury's honest confession regarding the Crimean war. It will be interesting to find out whether Mr. Asquith is capable of the same degree of candor. At the beginning of the war, some thoughtful Englishmen remarked: "Now that we are in, we have to win: but who will save us from the consequences of our victory." Hitherto the very existence of Germany has been England's protection in India. It is a grotesque fact that even now every German victory makes England's

hold on India more secure. If Germany is beaten, who will save India? Some Englishmen have answered the question with remarkable frankness. "Oh, well, we won't let the Germans be crushed altogether; as soon as they find that they are helpless without us, they will be glad enough to combine with us on our terms, and then India will be safer than ever. All this virtuous indignation over the scrap of paper, Belgian atrocities and Prussian militarism is of course mere drum play to hearten the reluctant recruits and lessen the chances of an American embargo on exports of munitions. The real thing that drove us into war was the knowledge that, if France and Russia got beaten, we should have to play second fiddle to Germany. We are fighting to retain our rank as a leading power."

If Britain were reunited to the United States, she would not be in danger of having to play second fiddle to anybody, and thus her only motive for continuing the war would disappear. In other words, it is the inestimable privilege of the United States to stop the war, effect Germanic union, and assure eternal peace by simply declaring her willingness to be reunited to Britain. It is well to recall Washington's words: "At first the idea of independence was abhorrent to me." With the complete disappearance of the cause of the quarrel between the Mother Country and her colonies, the separation of these two essentially democratic, English-speaking countries has become a groundless, unnatural, superannuated tradition, harmful to them and to humanity, economically, socially, ethically. With modern means of communication, their common interests could be more easily administered by a common government than the common interests of England and Scotland could 100 years ago.

Is it not equally true that the same modern means of communication have rendered the political separation between England and the "Older England on the Elbe" an anomaly? An English author wrote some years ago: "Englishmen who cross the North Sea to Hamburg or Bremen do not feel that they are in a foreign country. They see English towns, English faces, English manners, hear English tones." It ought not to be necessary to point out that some of the most prominent men in England, including the entire royal family, are of recent German origin. The foremost scientific men of England in a recent manifesto frankly admitted that Germany leads the world in science, in education, and in that organization which is the highest achievement of civilization. It does seem a most unbrotherly piece of arrogance on the part of the English, who already own the best lands of the globe, to tell their German brothers that they can have none of the remaining lands, and that the most highly educated nation must not presume to claim a voice in the councils of the world.

Somewhere between 1866 and 1870 the Duke de Gramont said in the French Chamber: "A nation, even though absolutely advancing, may relatively decline, when some other nation advances faster." He drew the inference that it was a vital necessity for France to prevent the unification of Germany. Britain today is in the same position. She is still advancing along all lines, but Germany, along some lines, has been advancing faster, and would advance still faster if she had more land. It is a sad state of affairs when one nation, in order to hold its own, feels tempted to check the progress of another nation and thus the progress of humanity in general. Anglo-American reunion would put an end to that temptation forever. The reunited nation would at once be placed beyond the

danger of eclipse, and would thereupon have every motive to stimulate, instead of checking, the progress of other nations. In the United States we reached that happy condition long ago. No state has any motive to feel alarmed, but every motive to rejoice, at the progress of other states.

In this situation it behoves the German-Americans to cast passion aside and give to the world an example of that Germanic calm—"Granitblockruhe"—which both Englishmen and Germans are fond of claiming as one of the leading characteristics of their race. The question is not what punishment England should receive for betting on the wrong horse; the sole question to the thinking man of German sympathies is: What is best for Germany? An alliance would evidently be incomparably the best thing for both. It would assure Germany's rank as a great power forever; it would afford the same assurance to England.

Suppose I have a chance to make a million dollars by a deal by which Smith would at the same time make \$10,000. Suppose I refuse to put that million dollars in my pocket lest I put that \$10,000 in Smith's pocket. What would my fellow-speculators think of me? They would call me a fool.

That Germany was ready in the spring of 1914 to enter into an alliance with England might be proved by volumes of quotations. There was ample response in England, but it was overpowered by the fear that the alliance would mean annexation to Germany. That fear would vanish if the English-speaking peoples were reunited. If England becomes convinced that this reunion can be effected by including Germany, and that it can be effected in no other way, she will quickly take the proper measures to become allied to Germany, on practically any conditions that Germany may lay down. Germany will not lay down any conditions that are unacceptable to her Germanic sister. That she is still ready for the alliance is proved by S. S. McClure's interview with Dr. Paul Rohrbach and many other German leaders of thought, whose answer to that effect was "surprisingly unanimous."

Here, then, is the rational, simple program for the German-Americans: Vote against an Anglo-American alliance unless Germany be included; vote for it if Germany be included.

This is true neutrality—trying to show a way by which all the combatants may come out of the fight as gainers. It is also the truest Americanism. The best American citizen is he who works for the highest interests of his country. Today the highest interest of the United States lies in the incomparable opportunity to become the leader toward permanent and most righteous peace—most righteous because under the control of the most advanced type of mankind. The man who seeks to gain this honor for his country, not by vague, barren eulogies of peace but by working for a definite, concrete plan is the best citizen, the truest American.—*E. Max Hassebach, 520 F street N. E., Washington, D. C.*

Yes, if these three nations make an alliance each with the other.
—*John R. Haynes, M. D., 2324 South Figueroa street, Los Angeles, Cal.*

With the general tenor of the resolution I am heart and soul in accord. An alliance between England and Germany seemed to me, even before the war, the one way to keep the peace in Europe. If America were strong enough to bring about a quadruple alliance

such as you recommend, it would indeed inaugurate a new era. There should be strong emphasis on a few points: the necessity of arming if our alliance is to be worth while; the necessity of submitting the matter to a general vote.—*Ernest F. Henderson*, author, Member American Historical Association, Monadnock, N. H.

Referring to your letter of March 27 and accompanying document, I feel very thoroughly the force of the arguments presented, but can not possibly take the time to write any worthwhile views on the subject.—*E. L. Ingram*, Professor of Railway Engineering and Geodesy, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

I favor the plan to form a defensive alliance with the three powers, or, if Germany refuses, with the present entente group. To fail to get the strength of organization would be to show our incompetence. Organization brought us strength in the adoption of our constitution, and further organization of the Celtanglian peoples must be to our advantage in promoting peace and in other ways.—*Roswell H. Johnson*, Professor of Geology, University of Pittsburg.

Amid the clamor of tongues professing neutrality one moment and the deafest, blindest partisanship the next, it is a relief to come across a man who is so truly neutral as to propose a plan by which both parties to the fight may come out gainers. I am doubly delighted to find that one of its aims is to restore Ireland to her rightful place in the family of nations, not only without loss, but with immense gain to England.

If the Irish-Americans can render this supreme service to Ireland, they would place themselves in a very peculiar light if they allowed their resentment against England to prevent it. No intelligent Irishman will be willing to confess that he hates England more than he loves Ireland. If independence cannot be gained for Ireland except by an act which will assure the perpetual security of England, then in God's name let us remember that we claim the name of Christians, and that we should display a very peculiar brand of Christianity if we hated our enemies more than we love ourselves. After all, the Englishmen who wronged Ireland are all dead. Try as we may, we cannot get even with them. Before we decide to hate their children, let us find out whether these children intend to continue the wrong done by their fathers. If they are willing to make amends by giving to Ireland the liberty which she craves, we ought not to prevent it by insisting on impossible conditions.

So long as Britain remains separated from the United States, she cannot afford to grant to Ireland complete control of her own affairs, for in so doing she would run imminent risk of setting up an enemy by her side, who in case of war would furnish a most convenient base of operations for a hostile fleet. Quite different would be the case if Britain and the United States were reunited as members of a world-embracing Celtanglian Federation, the leading members in the Anglo-Franco-German-American League of Peace. The 4½ million people in Ireland would never commit the absurdity of cutting loose from a federation containing all the remainder of the Irish race, to the number of at least 16 millions. If British statesmen saw a definite prospect of Anglo-American reunion, with its promise of perpetual security to the British Empire, they would hasten to do their share in bringing it about, by declaring their consent to a clause in the treaty of federation, stipulating that Ireland

shall be admitted to the federation as an equal; in other words, that Ireland's subordination to Britain shall cease, being replaced by that subordination to the Federal Government to which all the members would be equally subject.

Thus the rational thing for the Irish-Americans to do is to say to Britain: "We will vote for Anglo-American federation as soon as you agree that Ireland shall be a co-ordinate, not a subordinate member of the Federation. Until you agree to this, we will vote against federation."

Such a declaration would promptly produce the desired effect, and thus secure for the Irish-Americans the credit of having taken an essential part in establishing the world's peace on a permanent basis.

(Second Letter.)

I am informed that you are considering a proposed resolution providing for an alliance between Britain, France, Germany and the United States, as an international executive power to enforce the world's peace. As an Irish-American writing to an Irish-American, allow me to express the fervent hope that you will not neglect this incomparable opportunity to secure for our race the leadership toward the union of civilization, the union of Christendom, and perpetual peace, and at the same time to restore Ireland to her rightful place among the nations.

What the immediate effect of the resolution would be, it is of course impossible to foretell. It may pass unnoticed in the turmoil of the incipient campaign; on the other hand, its effect may be electric. Should it become known in Europe, it is quite possible that the German attack on Verdun might cease at once, because the Germans would not care to humiliate their future allies. For a similar reason the British might relax their blockade, and the Germans might stop their submarine warfare. In any case the resolution would go on record as the work of an Irish-American, and when it bears fruit, as it doubtless will in the near future, it will be a source of pride to every Irishman in every part of the globe to think that the greatest deed in history was initiated by a man of his race.

No fair-minded man will deny that, for the good of England, for the good of humanity, as well as for her own good, Ireland ought to be a self-governing nation, instead of being a mere appendage to Britain. The only question is: What is the best way to bring it about? Evidently it cannot be done by force of arms. Nor would it be desirable to sever all political connection between the two countries. The western half of Britain is as truly Celtic as Ireland herself, and even the eastern half is largely Celtic. The "Celtic fringe" is pitifully thin at best; it should not be further weakened by disunion. Scattered through the British colonies are several million Irishmen and other Celts. Surely the Irish do not wish their Celtic brothers in the British empire to regard them as foreigners!

Today, when the globe can be encircled in three months, when every nation considers the world its market, when international interests are visibly growing day by day, it would be rank heresy for any nation to try to reverse the manifest current of history. What we need is to unite those that are disunited, not to disunite those that are united.

Hand in hand with the process of centralization, there must of course be a process of decentralization, or devolution, as the English term it. The tasks of legislation nowadays are so manifold that the central legislatures cannot master them. What the world needs is the American system of federation and home rule, the strict division between federal and state functions, or, as our immortal Webster expresses it, "liberty and union, now and forever, one and inseparable." In our system, no state feels that it is an appendage of another; no state feels itself outranked; no state would accept independence even if it were offered. Let us Americanize the world by persuading it to adopt this American system. The first step in that direction must of course be to declare our willingness to be a member of the Americanized Republic of the World. We cannot afford to stultify ourselves by exhorting the world to adopt our federal system while yet we refuse to be a part of the federation.

The immediate union of all the nations is of course impracticable. What is needed is a nucleus large enough to assure its continued growth. The foremost requisite for that purpose is the reunion of the two fragments of the English-speaking people. This cannot be accomplished without the consent of the German-Americans, and that consent can not be obtained unless Germany be included in the union. Since neither Britain nor the United States would permit the exclusion of France, it is evident that the nucleus of the future World Republic must be an Anglo-Franco-German-American alliance.

This would at once secure for Ireland the same degree of self-government that Canada enjoys. Britain long ago withdrew her garrisons from Canada, knowing that Canada will always cling to the empire of her own free will. In the face of recent events, it would be idle to assert that Britain ought to trust Ireland to the same degree. Were Britain and America reunited, Britain could and would withdraw her last soldier from Ireland, because she would know that the Irish, having attained the dignified rank of a member in a world-embracing Celtanglian Federation, on a footing of equality with the other six members, Britain, the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa, would never commit the treason of cutting loose from all the other Celts.

(Third Letter.)

Permit me to add a few remarks to my earlier communications concerning your resolution aiming to establish permanent peace through an alliance between Britain, France, Germany, and the United States, as the nucleus of world federation.

The French and Germans, after their cruel sacrifices, will be glad of the prospect of permanent reconciliation and security. I am also inclined to believe that the majority of the American public have by this time made up their minds that by keeping up the tradition of no alliances, our nation would shirk its duty, and I have too high an opinion of my countrymen to think them capable of adopting the attitude of Cain, "Am I my brother's keeper?"

Thus the prospect of permanent peace is excellent if you can get the English to admit that they are merely the equals, not the superiors, of the French, Germans, Americans, and Irish. It is vain to deny, as some Englishmen do, that this feeling of superiority exists in England. The late W. T. Stead was fond of quoting a remark made to him by a Russian: "The trouble with you English is that

you seem to think that the Lord made you first and everybody else afterward."

Nothing is more natural than that feeling. Among individuals who have attained marked success, only the really superior ones have sense enough to attribute their success in due proportion to outward circumstances and to their innate ability. Public opinion in every nation is the result of millions of utterances, mostly made by mediocrities. Even the few superior men who appreciate things at their true value will generally deem it wise to encourage the national self-esteem as an aid to greater national success. Accordingly we find that every nation with a record of brilliant achievements does or did consider itself the crown of creation, a comfortable belief, which, once started, cannot be wholly eradicated even by centuries of misfortune. Among the Athenians, the most bare-faced utterance in that respect is Pericles' famous speech, quoted by Thucydides. The literature of the Romans is permeated with the belief that they were the born masters of the earth. The French, having twice attained the leadership in civilization, under Louis XIV and under Napoleon, grew accustomed to the title "la grande nation" and to the quotation "The best idea is worthless to humanity until it has passed through a French brain." Even in the day of Germany's humiliation, a German poet, recalling past glories, was capable of saying: "Deutsches Volk, du herrlichstes von allen." The self-glorification of a certain part of the German press since 1870 is notorious. If Germany emerges from the world war with her present record undimmed, it is to be hoped that her superior men will band together in a resolute effort to prevent a disgusting paroxysm of self-flattery on the part of the mediocrities.

Measured by results, England's success is of course the most brilliant in history. Her empire is the largest that ever existed, more than four times the size of the United States. For more than a hundred years she has enjoyed the undisputed supremacy of the seas; she has been the richest nation in the world, without a rival in industry and commerce. No wonder that the innate superiority of the average Englishman has become a dogma in his own mind, no wonder he grows impatient at the German assertion of equality.

That in average ability the British nation is not excelled by any nation on earth is proved by ample evidence. If Britain today is surpassed by Germany in science, education, industrial and social organization, as admitted every day by the most eminent British statesmen, that result is due not to inferior endowment, but to that very conviction of superiority which assumes that the traditional British methods are necessarily the best, and scorns to imitate the plodding neighbor. But who are the British people? They are a mixture of Celts, Romans, Germans, Danes, Normans. Until 1914 they were proud to call themselves Anglo-Saxons, that is to say, Germans; since then they have suddenly discovered that they are mostly Celts, a name which formerly they were not disposed to emphasize as a part of their composition. British superiority means of course superiority over Celts, Romans, Germans, Danes, and Normans. The stream is supposed to have risen higher than its sources; the whole is greater than the sum of its parts—mathematics notwithstanding.

An American scientist some time ago compiled a list of the prominent scientists of modern times. When he grouped them by nationalities, he was surprised to find that the English, French, and Germans were exactly equal in numbers. The unbiased philosopher will be

inclined to accept this result as a fair test of the comparative innate ability of the three nations, and to infer that the difference in their success is solely due to outward circumstances. Today the world marvels at Germany's national efficiency; during the 200 years before 1870, Germany's national inefficiency had become almost proverbial. Yet the historian who looks into details finds that among the hundreds of princes, dukes, and counts who held sovereign sway in Germany after 1648, there were scores of men fully equal in ability to Hindenburg and Mackensen, but compelled to waste their talents in mutual antagonism, instead of devoting them to the common Fatherland. French generalship after Louis XIV had sunk to a low ebb of fame, yet no sooner had the nation rediscovered itself in the revolution than it brought forth a host of first-class generals.

Let me here say a word for Ireland. To the superficial observer the story of Ireland during the last 700 years seems a record of uninterrupted failure, and he is but too prone to attribute it to an absence of able leaders. He who has candor enough to look beneath the surface will find that the sole cause of Ireland's failure was the same that afflicted Germany: disunion. Many of the Irish chiefs, Kavanaghs, O'Neills, O'Donnels, displayed an ability which would have placed them in the front rank if it had been exerted on a wider theater. Even as it was, it sufficed to keep the larger part of Ireland practically independent till Cromwell's time. Had that ability not been wasted in fratricidal strife, Ireland might have been a conquering instead of a conquered nation.

Unity and insularity were the two outward circumstances that enabled England's unquestionable native ability to achieve its phenomenal success—unity, not the fruit of her own wise choice, but imposed on her by a ruthless invader, William the Conqueror; insularity, the gift of geology. Insularity saved her from further invasion and thus enabled her to dispense with a large standing army, the source of the despotism which blighted the continental countries; unity saved her from self-waste and enabled her to take full advantage of the achievements of her sailors and soldiers.

Englishmen who love the truth—and their name is legion—can do nothing better at this moment than to persuade their countrymen to meet Frenchmen, Germans, Americans, Irishmen on a level. You cannot cordially cooperate with those who expect you to look up to them. It would be a humiliation for the Irish-Americans to vote for Anglo-American reunion if in that reunion Ireland is to be subordinate to Britain. Let Ireland be placed on a level with the other six members of the proposed Celtanglian Federation, and every reasonable Irish-American will vote for Anglo-American reunion as the only means by which he may enter into the closest possible reunion with the land of his fathers.

Celts and Germans were originally one people, as proved by their languages. For 2,000 years, probably much longer, they have striven for the mastery, with the result of becoming inextricably blended. They now represent the most advanced nations of mankind, the ones best fitted to initiate and control the Federation of the World. Both are tormented by the memory of disasters produced by disunion. Let them heed the voice of kindship, of reason, of self-interest, and of the highest morality. Let them combine into one great, beneficent power of Celtogermania, the magnetic nucleus of the World Republic.

In certain backward districts of Europe and America the law of vendetta still prevails. According to that law, it is dishonorable to

forgive an injury; you must wipe it out with the blood of the offender or of one of his relatives, even though you gain nothing thereby and even though you know beforehand that they will thereupon become subject to the same duty of retaliation on you and your family. The result is perpetual insecurity, perpetual tragedy, perpetual misery. The people who submit to that custom are rightly called barbarous. Britons, Frenchmen, Germans, Irishmen claim to be civilized. Let them prove it by rising superior to their ancient blood-feuds. If blow must always be returned for blow, there will never be an end of fighting. As an Irish-American I should deem it the greatest glory for the Irish race if one of its representatives called a halt to this eternal barbarous game of retaliation.—*Thomas C. Kelly, McArthur, Vinton Co., Ohio.*

Your inquiry affords me an opportunity to say a few things the publication of which will do no harm.

For over a year, 1692-3, the Salem witchcraft craze raged unabated. The "evidence" was deemed so overwhelming that nobody dared contradict it. Nineteen persons were hanged and one was pressed to death for the "crime." When the spell was broken the legislature appointed a general fast and supplication, and Judge Sewall, who had rendered judgment on the "evidence" at many witch trials, stood up in church on the fast day and implored the prayers of the people that the errors which he had committed might not be visited by the judgment of an avenging God on his country, his family, and himself.

The experience of the last two years leads one to doubt whether the average citizen today is more careful in sifting evidence than were the Salemites of 223 years ago. The larger part of the American press seems to think that the "evidence" leaves no doubt regarding these conclusions: that Germany is a wanton aggressor, seeking world dominion; that she is rapacious, arrogant, overbearing; that the German people are groaning under a horrible tyranny; that they are victims of a disease called militarism; that their method of warfare is characterized by a brutality of which no other civilized nation would be capable. When we sift the "evidence," we find it about as substantial as that of the witch trials. To go into details would mean to make accusations, and would profit nobody. Ten years from now, when passion has subsided and new emergencies shall have given rise to new international groups, prompting new currents of opinion, every candid mind will recognize, and some minds not candid will profess to recognize, that Germany's action in the present war has been purely defensive; that she has done nothing but what any nation, placed in similar circumstances, and possessed of equally resolute and conscientious leaders, would have done; that no serious mind in Germany ever dreamt of world dominion; that, if the ideal government is one which puts every class of work in the hands of those most competent to do it, Germany comes nearer the ideal than any other nation. Had her accusers been born in Germany, they would have been equally loud in accusing her enemies.

Some of my esteemed fellow-citizens will grow impatient at these remarks. "Does not the Kaiser call himself supreme war lord? Does not the opening line of Germany's national hymn expressly state that Germany must rule everything?"

"Der oberste Kriegsherr" does not mean "supreme war lord"; it

simply means "commander-in-chief," a title borne by President Wilson himself. "Deutschland, Deutschland, über alles" simply means that the poet loves his country above everything—a stereotyped sentiment professed by every citizen of every country, whether he feels it or not. Such is the "evidence" on which our enlightened contemporaries base their opinion. As for Germany's "rapacity," it may suffice to recall that Britain owns over 13 million square miles of land, Russia over 8½ million, France over 4½ million, the United States over 3 million, Germany only 1,208,000. Little Belgium owns nearly as much.

England has never ceased lamenting the evil fate which placed the control of her policy in the hands of a narrow-minded king and a blundering minister at the moment when the relations between the mother country and her American colonies had reached a crisis which called for the broadest statesmanship. The day will come when England's participation in the war against Germany will be recognized by the wisest of Englishmen as an even greater blunder. Morley, Trevelyan and Burns, who resigned from the Cabinet rather than share the responsibility for this fratricidal war, will be likened to Chatham.

This does not mean that no mistakes have been made on the German side. The percentage of indiscreet, rash, brutal people is about the same in all countries. It would not be difficult to gather a bouquet of quotations from the German press, as silly and offensive as could be found anywhere. Unfortunately such utterances are apt to attract more attention than those of sober people. It is the statesman's duty to discriminate between this froth and the real representative opinion.

It remains to inquire how the stumbling-block may be turned into a stepping-stone. The war has had at least one good effect: it has brought Americans to realize that this planet of ours is very small, and that the attempt to fence off a little corner of it and pretend that this corner has nothing to do with the rest, is Pumpkinville philosophy. Before the war, the suggestion of an alliance of the United States with other nations was not regarded as practical politics. Now it is the dominant thought in the minds of our ablest political leaders, including President Wilson. The immense importance of this change lies in this: that as soon as America is willing to abandon her unreasoning tradition of isolation, she will become the long-sought missing link between England and Germany. By thus reuniting the three great Germanic nations, we may repair not only the blunder of 1914—so far as repair is possible—but also the blunder of George III in 1775. We can not get rid of our hyphens; we can only pretend to ignore them. Heredity is more important than geography. Instead of trying to silence the voice of kinship, instead of repudiating our connection with our home lands, true patriotism will prompt us to give it definite and effective form. Instead of one hyphen, let us all acknowledge two, or rather three, for the alliance is evidently impossible unless France be included. The Quadruple Alliance would practically mean the union of the Celtic and Germanic branches of the Aryan family, the two branches which at this moment comprise by far the larger part of civilization. Celto-germania would mean the union of civilization and eternal peace.

And to think that it might have been done twenty years ago without war, if the "practical" men had not scouted the idea as a

dream of "impractical" theorists!—*Dr. L. R. Klemm, 919 B street N. E., Washington, D. C.*

The goal in the onward march of western civilization will not have been reached until the processes which have been going on for two centuries have welded these two great branches of the Anglo-Saxon race into a substantial homogeneous people that will reflect credit upon the hegemony of our race and further advance the influence of Anglo-Saxon civilization.—*Philander C. Knox*, former Senator from Pennsylvania; Attorney General, 1901-1904; Secretary of State, 1909-1913. Speech at Lancaster, Pa., January 10, 1916.

I agree with you in every essential point. For many years I have been hoping for Germanic union, for to my mind the preservation of the Germanic race is the highest aim of humanity. I can assure you that the leading statesmen of Germany have for many years sincerely and patiently sought an understanding with England and France, especially our Kaiser, who regards the preservation of peace for the Germanic world as his divinely ordained mission. Our Imperial Chancellor, too, has striven for peace, but England and France repelled the proffered hand.

This makes me fear that England and France will not be content with the proposals made in your pamphlet, although the leading men in Germany will be ready to make concessions. The retention of Belgium is not a vital matter for us, except during the continuance of the war, to prevent its munition factories and industrial plants from reinforcing the enemy. The same is true of northern France. The French, however, will not be content with the recovery of the French-speaking districts; they demand all Alsace-Lorraine. For that matter they went to war not so much on that account as for the sake of "revanche."

The English were willing to come to terms only on condition that we surrender our independence and become their subjects. The Russians regarded us as the main obstacle that prevented them from trampling on Europe. Thus was formed the great conspiracy against us.

The English are a proud nation, but we are of the same blood, and hence we could not bear to be their servants. The hatred kindled in Germany by the English declaration of war has perceptibly declined, since we have found that they and their dusky partners cannot bring Germany to her knees. Today the English are not yet willing to grant us breathing space; but a year from now I hope they will have become convinced that they cannot strangle their Germanic brothers.

Our peace-loving Kaiser and our Chancellor will gladly make concessions. We need not retain any districts of alien speech in the west. On the east, however, Germany must have a sphere of influence; that is a vital question for the Germanic (Teutonic) race. The defeat of Germany would also lead to the collapse of the British Empire, because Britain would then be unable to defend India either against Russia or against eastern Asia. At present England is our principal enemy, but in the future it will be Russia, and in a more remote future eastern Asia will be the enemy of us all.

So far as I am concerned, I will try to popularize the idea of Germanic union. I will review your paper in the *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschafts-Biologie*, and send a copy to Consul von Hoffmann, who has written a book on racial hygiene in North America. I will also try to interest the daily press.

Let us hope that Germanic union will spring from this fratricidal war, just as German union sprang from the fratricidal war of 1866. The English know now that we are their peers.—*Dr. Fritz Lenz*, Associate Editor of *Archiv für Rassen- und Gesellschafts-Biologie* (the leading magazine of eugenics), Munich, Germany. (Translation.)

If you can get a resolution for such an alliance passed through Congress, backed by sufficient approval and leadership in Congress to begin negotiations through diplomatic channels, the United States has prestige enough to get a hearing.—*I. A. Loos*, Head Professor of Political Economy and Sociology, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.

I am in full sympathy with your ideas as regards making a world war impossible in the future by forming a constructive alliance, strong enough in brains, resources, and men to resist any other group of powers, and to which alliance the United States should be a party.

There never will be any lasting peace as long as nations remain non-united to other nations, and as long as children and adults are taught that their country is better than somebody else's country. The attempt to build up a powerful quadruple entente will certainly be a step in the right direction toward the United States of the World.—*Frank N. Meyer*, Agricultural Explorer, Bureau of Plant Industry, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

I am heartily in accord with the object which the resolution has in view, and think it would be a wise and patriotic movement to introduce such a resolution in Congress. I greatly hope, if introduced, it will meet with their approval and be submitted to the American people. If it is, I am very sure it will meet with practically unanimous approval.—*Brig. Gen. E. W. Nichols*, Superintendent Virginia Military Institute, Lexington, Va.

I am glad to see any move made aiming in the right direction. We have climbed upward in the group organization from the patriarchal family through clan and tribe to the nation, and logically the next step must be the SUPER-NATION. In all human probability your proposition is in the direct line of evolution, and is one of the steps that men have got to take if they are going to adjust themselves to the highly complex environment with which they are now confronted.

In spite of the great authority of Washington and of his undoubted wisdom, we must remember that he died nearly a century and a quarter ago. While he could foresee the grandeur of national development on this continent, he could not possibly have foreseen its intense complexity and the innumerable connections of trade, thought, and feeling which have been interwoven into the fabric of civilization. All this involves the readiness to take our share both in the councils and in the action which may at any time be necessary for the support of such a policy. This means some kind of an efficient military organization proportional to our population and resources.—*Edward D. Page*, President Merchants' Protective Association; Fellow Royal Statistical Society of Great Britain, etc., 31 Nassau street, New York.

The bond between us is a bond of blood. I say, with due regard to other blood and other nations, that it is with us who speak the language of Shakespeare that the responsibility of ruling the world

must rest. The Pilgrim Fathers were not only God-led men, but they were God-led Englishmen.—*Ambassador Walter H. Page*, in speech at the dedication of the *Mayflower* obelisk at Southampton, England.

Since the application of steam to ocean transportation, nations have become more intimately dependent upon each other than the States of the Union were in 1860. Nations, when they can think rationally, must provide against contingencies that arise when the national mind is paralyzed by a paroxysm of emotions aroused by some sudden accident. For this reason I think that the United States should enter into an alliance with the leading nations of the world to make such an occurrence impossible. In conformity with our democratic ideals, nothing could be more appropriate than to submit such a proposition to the approval of the people.—*E. George Payne*, Department of Educational Psychology, Harris Teachers' College, St. Louis, Mo.

To one accustomed to view man in the light of his evolution, much of the peace literature is a dreary sea of sentimentalism. It is a great relief to discover such a solid little island of logic as is the pamphlet "Arm to Disarm." It shows a grasp of the biologic laws governing the evolution of the human species which ought to be very common, but is in fact extraordinarily rare.

The biologist knows that if the race is to progress rather than to degenerate, the superior types of men must have the best chance to spread. In order to have the chance, they must have the power. The proverbial source of power is union. Hence the aim of enlightened statesmanship must be some sort of union—at least a "working agreement"—among the superior human elements.

"By their fruits ye shall know them." The larger part of civilization is today concentrated in four great nations: Britain, France, Germany, and the United States. A league consisting of these four would practically amount to the union of civilization, and would be so overwhelmingly strong as to be able to forbid war all over the globe. It would assure to the superior human elements a better chance to spread than they now enjoy, and would thus afford the only possible means for fundamental betterment of the race as a whole.

This being the paramount condition of the progress of the human race—and incidentally of the increase of human happiness—everything must be subordinated to it. The tradition of "no entangling alliances" was good so long as this Quadruple Alliance was not possible. But today, if we could possibly create the Quadruple Alliance by offering to join hands with the three nations of which most of our ancestors were proud and patriotic citizens not long ago, then the policy of "no alliances" is directly destructive to our best interests, and equally to the best interests of the race as a whole. If we fail to combine with other superior human groups into a world-commanding power, we may soon be left alone to face a very different combination.

We are told that all such proposals must wait till the war is over. This means that we must stand idle while our natural allies bankrupt one another in money and lives. From an evolutionary point of view, the human race has probably lost more ground since August, 1914, than in any other equal period of its history. In their present deadlock, none of the combatants feel that they can afford to make the first advances toward peace; yet we know that they are all sighing for it. Our mediation would be hailed with joy, if accompanied by an

offer which would absolutely safeguard the future of the three leading belligerents, because it is to secure such a safeguard that they are fighting.

By all means give the American voters a chance to prove that they are of the superior type.—*Paul Popenoe, Editor The Journal of Heredity, 511 Eleventh street, Washington, D. C.*

There is a manifest resemblance between your program and that of the League to Enforce Peace, but there are important differences. It may be a useful piece of work to analyze these differences.

1. The League says expressly that it does not contemplate any action tending to shorten the present war. Your resolution is expressly designed to prepare the way for mediation and thus to put an end to the war.

2. The League does not specify the nations which are to form the combination. Your resolution specifies Britain, France, Germany, and the United States. Evidently none of these four can be omitted if the combination is to be efficient. Evidently, also, the four nations named would by themselves be quite sufficient to enforce peace. Such being the case, it does seem as if the admission of other nations from the very start would needlessly add to the difficulty of getting the combination into working order. Even at best that difficulty will be very great.

3. The League states that the sole purpose of the proposed combination is the preservation of peace. Your resolution expressly provides for an alliance to promote the self-interests of the contracting parties. It seems to me that your program reveals a somewhat deeper study of human nature. It may be doubted whether at the moment of test any nation will be self-sacrificing enough to shed the blood of its sons merely in order that the world may have peace. On the other hand, we know that nations are but too ready to shed the blood of their sons in order to gain some selfish national advantage. When Britain, France, Germany, and the United States are once united, their selfish interests, no longer conflicting, will compel them to use their overwhelming force to prevent war. No blood will be shed, because no nation will be foolish enough to oppose such a power.

It will be objected that even if Britain, France, Germany, and the United States do become allied, there is no certainty that they will not go to war among themselves, despite all treaties. This is true of any alliance; but it is less likely in the present case than in any other that can be imagined. Nations nowadays do not go to war unless they think their future in danger. When the four nations are united, their future will be absolutely secure.

Again, it will be objected that the four nations would be tempted to abuse their power. This again applies to any conceivable alliance, and no mere stipulation can prevent it. But if an alliance of the four most enlightened nations would be apt to tyrannize, certainly that danger would not be lessened by admitting less enlightened nations. The four nations are democracies, and a true democracy does not tyrannize. We certainly cannot imagine that the people of the United States would ever be tempted to tyrannize over smaller nations. Now the vast majority of our people are Britons, Frenchmen, and Germans by birth or descent, with the same instincts as our kindred in the Old World. As soon as the democracies of Britain, France, and Germany feel that their future is as secure as ours, they will not care to tyrannize any more than we do.

In brief, it seems to me that the program of the League to Enforce

Peace is the generic form of an idea of which your resolution is the specific form. There is no conflict between them, and I should not be surprised if the League, after looking into your plan, would adopt it and push it enthusiastically.—*Arthur Ramsay*, President Washington Peace Society, 1401 Euclid street, Washington, D. C.

The idea of giving the American voters an opportunity to express themselves on whether or not the United States should enter into a defensive alliance with other nations is excellent. I should certainly vote in the affirmative if it came to me; but I should like the plan better if it did not restrict the possible alliance to Britain, France, and Germany. A weighty consideration in favor of presenting this matter to the voters is that it would give an opportunity for a campaign of education of the people in national and international morality. Such education is indispensable to success in any attempt to relieve the world of such catastrophes as the one we are now witnessing.—*William E. Ritter*, Director the Scripps Institution for Biological Research of the University of California, La Jolla, near San Diego, Cal.

While I cannot approve the author's reasoning in all particulars, yet the fact that Britain, France, Germany, and the United States are among the most powerful and enlightened countries on the earth, and that they have attained considerable liberality in thought and speech and in government, would make a union of these four powers capable of accomplishing a good deal for humanity. The offer might be entirely unavailing, but I think it would at worst do no harm to make it.—*Frederick W. Sanders*, Ph. D., Dean of Hollywood Junior College and Head of Department of Social Science, Los Angeles, Cal.

An alliance between England, France, Germany, and the United States would insure the peace of the world, and I think nothing so desirable as such an alliance. If a mandate from the people be necessary, I see no reason why it should not be asked. I do not agree with some things Mr. Stein suggests—*e. g.*, the settlement of the Belgian question or the Serbian. But that has nothing to do with the general proposition. Any way to get Britain, France, Germany, and the United States into an alliance to safeguard the future peace of the world has my support.—*Charles Forster Smith*, Professor of Greek and Classical Philology, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

The best comment I can make on your plan is to quote a dispatch printed in the *Washington Post* of July 13:

"DETROIT, MICH., July 13.—That the drafting of the Russo-Japanese treaty is merely the first step in negotiations that ultimately will result in the formation of a triple offensive and defensive alliance between Japan, Russia, and Germany was the opinion expressed today by Charles Denby, of Detroit, former American Consul General at Peking. Denby has just returned from an extensive trip through China and Japan.

"Japan realizes that her alliance with Great Britain would be non-effective in the event of trouble with the United States," Denby said, "and she is anxious to negotiate new alliances elsewhere. Pro-German sentiment is overwhelming in Japan, despite the country's connection with the allies.

"It is not true that Japan purposes to gain her ends by force in the near future. But it is true that the Japanese regard

their desire to enter, upon terms of equality, the territories of the nations bordering along the Pacific as one destined to be accomplished by force if ultimately necessary.

"The Japanese statesmen most certainly believe that the Japanese are destined to be the propagandists of a new yellow civilization, beginning where the white has left off and reaching limits of which the white has not yet dreamed."

Mr. Denby is a man of lifelong experience in Far Eastern matters. When such a man speaks in this tone, it is time to open our ears and eyes. That an alliance with Russia and Japan would be intensely galling to Germany's pride goes without saying; but rather than allow herself to be crushed, she will swallow the pill, especially in view of the immense advantages which she would find in the exploitation of the vast Russian Empire, three times as large as the United States.

What would this mean? It would mean the union of all Asia and more than half of Europe into a tremendous power of over 1,000 million people, with the cheapest labor in the world, to be quickly organized by the highest intellect of Germany. China would be jointly controlled by the three allies, and the open door would shut with a snap. The 315 million people of India would become Russian subjects, while the Dutch and French East Indies, the Philippines, and Australia would become Japanese colonies. The four million white men in Australia, becoming subject to Mongolians, would soon be lost in the yellow flood.

That we with our unaided strength could hold out against such a power not even the wildest dreamer will venture to assert. South America would be overrun first, and we should be as powerless to defend it as if it were located in the moon. When South America is Mongolized and converted into a base of operations of Mongolian armies and navies, how shall we prevent the Mongolization of Mexico and Canada? When finally we have Mongolians to the south and north of us, and millions coming every year across the Pacific, how shall we keep them out of our own country? Even if we spend nine-tenths of our revenue for army and navy, we shall be hopelessly outstripped by a power ten times stronger than ourselves, with labor six times cheaper.

A stitch in time saves nine. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. Smother the spark and there will be no conflagration. Congress has voted three-quarters of a billion dollars for armaments; but if we do nothing else, we might just as well throw that money into the sea. The only means to avert the coming disaster is the union of the white race. Germany must not be driven into alliance with Asia; she must be enabled to remain what she is now and what she wishes to be: one of the pillars of western civilization.

It would be silly for us to attempt to unite the white race unless we are willing to be part of the union. Since it would be vain to attempt to unite all the white nations at once, let us start with those nations whose union will suffice to attract the rest. In other words, the most urgent need of the day is an alliance between Britain, France, Germany, and the United States. Since the other three nations cannot take the lead in this matter, that duty devolves on us.

Of course, it would be almost an idle ceremony to offer our alliance to Britain, France, and Germany unless we possess an armament large enough to make our alliance valuable to them. As soon as this Quadruple Alliance is in working order, it will represent such an

overwhelming power that a further increase of armaments will not be necessary, and very soon it will be possible to reduce the existing armament and still keep it strong enough to enforce universal peace. It is strictly true, therefore, that by voting for the largest possible increase of army and navy at this moment, as the indispensable means to bring about the world-commanding, irresistible Quadruple Alliance, we shall have the best assurance of being able in the near future to reduce our armament to very reasonable limits without risk to the permanence of world-wide peace.

Some of our wise men tell us that the American people will not enter into an alliance, even though they could thereby insure eternal peace. How do you know that? You infer it because you have heard the phrase "entangling alliances." The fact is that the people have never had a chance to express their wishes on the subject. How can we find out their wishes? By asking them.

And there never was a question on which the voters had a more sacred right to be consulted. It amounts to this: Shall we or shall we not have eternal peace? Shall this nation dwell in perpetual security or shall it drift on to an abyss?

The time may soon come when we must have allies or perish. It would be childish levity to wait till the day of need is at hand. If we wish to prove that we are a nation of adults, we must take steps at once to make sure that we shall have allies when we need them. Today an offer of alliance from us to our three parent nations would be received with transports of joy; if we fail to profit by the opportunity, the time may come when we shall pray on our knees for an ally and pray in vain, because by that time those who should have been our allies may have ruined each other.

No prudent man will say that an alliance of Germany, Russia, and Japan is impossible. The opposite case does look almost inconceivable, but yet a brief consideration of it may be instructive. Eastern Siberia is almost denuded of Russian troops. If the Japanese made an attack on it, for which they could readily find a plausible pretext, they could take Manchuria, Mongolia, and eastern Siberia almost without firing a shot. They would thus gain some three million square miles, with vast ore deposits, and at least half of it suitable for farming. Russia would be prostrated and could not recover for ten years. The 20 million Manchus and Mongols would swell the 70 millions of Japan to 90 millions, and an alliance with China would supply additional millions, making it impossible for Russia to recover her possessions unaided. Who would aid Russia? Not Britain, for even if she had the troops she would need them in India and could not transport them to the critical points. The narrow strait between Japan and Korea would be closed by mines, preventing the British navy from interrupting Japan's communications. Germany would not care to resuscitate the Russian peril, which has been her nightmare for 50 years. The thrifty capitalists of the United States would probably welcome the chance to sell ammunition to both sides. You will say that the white nations would surely combine to prevent one of their number from being robbed by Mongolians. Why do they not combine now instead of trying to ruin each other? In brief, if Japan takes eastern Siberia she will most likely keep it. She would then be in a position to form an effective alliance with China, because she would no longer be under the necessity of trying to encroach on China. The united Mongolians would soon make short work of British rule in India.

We can nip this danger in the bud by taking the initiative toward the Quadruple Alliance, which would be the best protection for Russia against the Asiatic danger. To neglect this duty would be to commit national suicide. An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

Both President Wilson and ex-President Taft have declared that the traditional policy of avoiding alliances is no longer in harmony with the best interests of this country. Their opinion is shared by the League to Enforce Peace, including such distinguished men as Cardinal Gibbons, Andrew D. White, Alton B. Parker, John Hays Hammond, Senator Theodore Burton, and the presidents of Harvard, Princeton, Wisconsin, California, and Virginia universities. When such intellectual leaders favor an alliance, it certainly seems about time to find out definitely what the American people think on the subject. And the only way to find out is a popular vote.

In *The World's Court* of July, 1916, Dr. John Wesley Hill says: "When peace comes, it must come unequivocally. It would be a tragedy beyond human estimation to have this expensive conflict die out like a mere guttering candle, leaving no basis for a permanent or worthy solution. The real peace talk must not be variable and a flutter in every breeze of martial vicissitude. The nations dare not again submit to a wobbling and sham peace, such as has characterized so many contests. Unless a peace so broad and secure that it cannot be shaken be achieved, this war, great and terrible and unprecedented as it undoubtedly is, will stand but the first in a series of wars so unspeakable in scope as to appall the mind."

Exactly. And the only way to terminate the interminable is to create an irresistible power whose members shall find it to their interest to stick together.—*Frank O. Smith, ex-Congressman, Dunkirk, Md.*

Let me make a forecast of what will happen when you publish your idea of an Anglo-Franco-German-American League of Peace. I will put my forecast in the form of a conversation between a critic, A, and yourself, B.

A. It is impossible to reconcile the interests of such keen rivals as Britain, France, and Germany.

B. Their interests are not more irreconcilable than those of the several sections of the United States. Our States remain united because they recognize that the advantages of union are far greater than the advantages of disunion would be. Let Britain, France, and Germany be once united and have a little practical experience of the advantages of union and they will never dream of separating.

A. But why not take in all the nations?

B. A moment ago you said that the union of four nations is impossible because of the difficulty of reconciling their interests. If the union of four is impossible, the union of eight is twice impossible, and the union of forty is ten times impossible. If it is so difficult to reconcile conflicting interests, why should you unnecessarily multiply the number of interests to be reconciled?

A. But a predominant power like the proposed alliance would be tyrannical.

B. Not more so than the United States is toward Cuba. If we cared to tyrannize over Cuba, no power on earth would try to stop us. Why don't we tyrannize? Because our people have no taste for it. Neither would the people of the proposed Quadruple Alliance,

who are all of the same breed as ourselves, endowed with the same instincts. We have to trust the people in any case. It is wiser to trust the people of the freest and most enlightened nations than to trust a hodgepodge of free and unfree, civilized and barbarous.

A. But why submit this matter to the vote of the people? Is it not a matter for Congress and the President to deal with?

B. If you had had any experience with legislative assemblies, you would know that Congress will never take the responsibility of such a step until the people have declared their will.

A. But—

There is no need of going any farther. The only object of gnawing through the shell of objections is to get at the kernel of helpfulness. Mr. A has no kernel; he is all shell. Let him learn to play solitaire, finding answers to his own objections, while you test the sharpness of your intellectual teeth on nuts that have kernels.—*Middleton Smith*, 2544 Fourteenth street, Washington, D. C.

I concur in Prof. Irving Fisher's opinion.—*Theobald Smith*, President Rockefeller Institute, Princeton, N. J.

I approve of the idea, which seems to be in line with the program of the League to Enforce Peace, of which I am a member. The matter is one for our State Department to act on, with the advice and confirmation of our elected legislators. I feel that no referendum beyond the Congressmen is necessary, or even desirable.—*J. Beaumont Spencer*, Spencer & Randolph, Consulting and Constructing Engineers, 165 Broadway, New York.

Your joint resolution appeals to me, a Jeffersonian Democrat, first, because your referendum is the essence of democracy, and, second, because the peace of the world, so necessary to human liberty and happiness, is essentially a Jeffersonian goal. The United States, the leading neutral power, the United Kingdom, the leading naval power, and the German empire, the leading military power, joined in a world peace pact, would constitute a definite and powerful nucleus which all the world would heed. The entente allies would speedily join Britain; the central allies would follow Germany, and the neutrals would follow the example of the United States, and we would soon have a United World Republic devoted to the cause of international peace.—*Francis N. Stacy*, journalist, Deputy Public Examiner of Minnesota, 1905-1913, 1771 T street, Washington, D. C.

I am heartily in sympathy with this resolution, for I believe that some such alliance is the only means of preventing war in the future. I should like to suggest amendments, but I would still favor the resolution as it stands. I think the best way to go about it is to permit the people of the United States to express their opinion upon it in an election.—*George H. Von Tungeln*, Professor of Applied Economics and Social Science, Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.

I am in hearty sympathy with the plans of the League to Enforce Peace, and believe that the nearest approach to world peace can be attained by placing the preponderance of armament in the hands of peaceful people. If the United States army were as large in proportion to the size of the nation as the New York police is in proportion to the size of the city, we should not now be living in such humiliating conditions. We should rather enjoy the respect which is due to this nation, and would be in a position to influence other nations for

good.—*Henry Woodhouse*, a Governor of the Aero Club of America, 297 Madison avenue, New York.

When people tell me that there will always be war, because it is the necessary consequence of human nature, I cannot help thinking of the time when we were told that men would never fly, because nature gave them no wings. Yet how simple and easy it was to make the wings and use them, after somebody had shown us how to do it! Everybody now wonders why he had not thought of such a simple thing.

In all probability the creation of permanent peace will be just as simple. Get England and Germany to combine and you have eternal peace. The United States can make them combine by offering her alliance to both. Are our people willing to make that offer? Ask them.

In a word, the statesman who introduces the proposed resolution will lead the way to peace, as Columbus led the way to America. To be known throughout the future ages as the Columbus of peace is a prospect which may well fire the ambition of any sincere and aspiring mind.

If America is willing to be reunited to Britain, the British people will feel that the future of their empire is forever secure. Instead of trying to starve Germany, they will then have every motive to offer her the most advantageous terms of peace in order to gain the German-Americans' consent to Anglo-American reunion. It is entirely probable that the immediate effect of your resolution would be the relaxation of the blockade which Britain maintains against Germany. Germany, as we know by her repeated declaration, would at once respond by restricting or even abandoning her submarine warfare. Thus your resolution would achieve the object for which President Wilson is striving. It would achieve much more. It would enable the President to offer mediation with the practical certainty of its being accepted.

Under the circumstances in which I am placed, I must request you not to publish my name. My letter will do just as much good without my signature as with it—perhaps more. My German-American friends would roast me if they learned that I had said a good word for England, and I do not wish to put them to the trouble of having to eat their words when England and Germany are friends once more. I think it my duty, however, to express the deep conviction that any German-American who opposes your plan will prove not a friend, but an enemy to Germany.

Mr. S. S. McClure's Berlin dispatch, published in the *New York Evening Mail* of February 25, 1916, proves that the leaders of Germany thought consider an alliance between England, Germany, and the United States to be the only means to assure permanent peace. Thus there can be no doubt that your resolution would be welcomed in Germany. Surely the people who are on the spot understand Germany's interests better than the people who are 4,000 miles away. When the German press declares in favor of your plan, the German-American press will necessarily follow.—*A German-American*.